Theological Magazine

of the

Evangelical Synod of North America.

Published by the Evangelical Synod of North America. Price per year (six numbers) $2.00; to foreign countries, $2.20. Rev. H. Kamphausen, Dr. theol. (Giessen Univ.), 9807 Cudell Ave., Cleveland, Ohio, Editor.

All communications relating to editorial work, all contributions and exchanges must be addressed to the editor.

All communications relating to business matters must be addressed to Eden Publishing House, 1712-18 Chouteau Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

VOL. 56. ST. LOUIS, MO. JANUARY 1928.

THE INSPIRATIONAL VALUE OF CHURCH HISTORY

By Prof. Philip Vollmer, Ph.D., D.D.

Ministers of the gospel should read church history more than they usually do because of its many-sided values. The study of general, denominational and local church history, as well as biographies, leads to a truer appreciation of the past, to the better understanding of present conditions, and thus enables a clearer outlook to the future. It broadens the mind, contributes to general culture and inspires heart and will to work with stronger enthusiasm for Christ and His church. This essay is limited to the consideration of the *inspirational value* of the study of the various phases of church history.

God in History

A thorough study of Church history in the first place, inspires the student with a larger measure of faith that God is in history. "History," said the German philosopher Hegel, "is the evolution of the absolute spirit and hence supremely rational throughout." While Hegel's system, as a whole, is dangerously near to pantheism and fatalism in that it regards the individual as the blind organ of the world spirit, yet the foregoing dictum expresses correctly the Christian conception of history. It satisfies the scientific instinct for unity of plan which we discern in history as it interlaces the ages. In the records of the past we perceive a perfect and boundless wisdom pervading the history of the world in all its periods,

minutely caring for what is obscurest and smallest and feeblest, sublimely comprehending what is largest and grandest and strongest. We discern a power which, alike without haste and without rest, moves on in its noiseless path unhindered and unchallenged from age to age, melting when it will, with sunlight, smiting when it will, with lightning. Best of all, we discern a love which has opened itself to man like the unfolding of the heavenly gates, sending forth the Son of God to reclaim a lost world. God's providence is, however, not in all cases, visible to the naked eye of fallible men. Sometimes His footsteps are indeed plain as daylight, but very often He moves in a mysterious way His wonders to perform; yet He is always there and His presence is constantly felt. The distinction of the world's history into sacred and profane may do for the purpose of classification in text-books, but strictly speaking, profane history, which according to the etymology of the word, would be history without God in it, is impossible. In Him we live and move and have our being. To exclude God from history is to thrust out its eyes and tear the living heart from its bosom. It would make its annals a tangled web of human folly, a subjective play of human passions and intrigue, without any guiding principle or certain aim, a lawless play of caprice without any unity as the basis of the manifold, an unspeakably dreary thing, void of all inspiration. This is not the Christian conception of history. To us the whole history of the world is, as St. Augustine in his "City of God" describes it, the "unfolding of the Kingdom of God." God is even concerned with those portions of history in which the power of evil is displayed. In his infinite wisdom he brings out good from evil and turns the plans and purposes of his foes to the benefit of his children, as Geibel says:

"Seines Rathes heil'gen Schluessen,
Auch die Boesen dienen muessen,
Wenn sie thun nach ihrer Lust."

What is true of history in general must be particularly emphasized of that branch of history which traces the rise and progress of the Kingdom of God upon earth. In Church history the reader is ushered into the immediate presence of the Head of the Church. Through it he learns that "God is in the midst of her." "In the midst of the seven candle-sticks there is one like unto the Son of Man." (Rev. 1: 13). Everywhere in church history we discern traces of Divine footsteps, attesting the fulfillment of the promise, "Lo I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." The annals of the church are one long, practical, commentary on the character, the ways and the eternal purpose of God, and being such,

they are intensely inspiring to the devout student. How vividly do they illustrate God's wisdom and Goodness and mercy! What solemn display does history furnish of divine justice! While due homage is to be paid to the leading actors in history, the master hand that guided them must not be overlooked. Not man's power but Divine wisdom made modern times.

Time fails me adequately to illustrate these principles by examples from the rich storehouse of church history, all pointing in the one direction that God is in history as its inspiring force. How plainly, for example, can we see the hand of God in the two pre-Christian centuries, when he prepared the world for the spread of the Gospel by scattering thousands of Jews throughout the Roman Empire to make known a higher and purer conception of God as well as by the spread of the Greek language and culture throughout the known world. How clearly can we read God's thoughts in guiding Columbus to discover America, and yet keeping him from North America, thus preventing the colonization of this part of our country by Catholic Spain and Portugal, and reserving it for a haven of refuge when the persecuted Protestants of Europe should require one. And this came to pass by providential intervention of God. Guided by a chart which Tuscanelli, a Florentine astronomer, had prepared for him, Columbus passed the Canaries and would have reached the coast of our southern states, had he not been persuaded by one of his companions to turn to the southwest, in the direction which a flock of pigeons was observed to take. But for this sudden change in the discoveror's course, the descendants of Spanish Roman Catholics might now inhabit our Atlantic seaboard. And is not God's providence truly adorable in making use even of the follies and ambitions of emperors, kings, princes and nobles in the Reformation period, thus preventing the concentration of these powers against Protestantism at a time when the movement was still too weak to withstand a concerted onslaught?

Thus viewed, Church History should be for the teacher of religion a study of the first interest, a fountain of the richest spiritual enjoyment and instruction, an interpretation of the conflict between human passion and divine law in our own times, and the best interpretation of the ways of God, by showing that

"Deep in unfathomable mines,
Of never failing skill,
He treasures up His bright designs,
And works His sovereign will."

Church History Inspires Love for the Search of Truth

The study of Church History and especially that part which traces the development of Christian doctrine is well calculated to inspire the devout student with a deep admiration for the strenuous efforts made by many leaders of the church to arrive at the truth, though we as Protestants and modern thinkers may feel bound to reject many of the conclusions they arrived at. The theology of the church has a history as clearly defined as any other. We find in it a gradual subjective development of Christian truth, as crystallized in dogmas, creeds and complete systems of theology. The Lord expressly prepared the church for just such advance when he said, "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot hear them now. When the Spirit of Truth is come, he will guide you into all truth." There is a constant, though sometimes interrupted advance in the church's assimilation of truth, yet not unmixed with grave errors in some sections. For the progress of the church may be compared to a mountain path which leads the traveler to the summit, not indeed by a straight road, but in a zigzag line. The summit of truth never lies in the extremes to which in the heat of controversy its champions are driven, but in the middle or rather in the depth. The reader of Church history will learn that the symbols of our faith have not always been precisely what they are today. The Council of Constantinople, for example, went farther than that of Nice, and those of Ephesus and Chalcedon went farther still Later followed the numerous creeds of Protestantism. Nor dare we say that the theology of Christendom is yet complete. While the great doctrines of the Trinity Atonement, Sin, Grace, Justification, etc., have been discussed to the last refinement of logic, so that nothing new of any moment can probably ever be said concerning them, yet better statements even of these fundamental doctrines of our creeds are possible. Many modern thinkers, through the study of church history, are being inspired to work out a new theology for the old faith.

In speaking of progressive development, we do not mean an advance beyond Chirst as he is revealed in the Scriptures, but rather a fuller appreciation of Him who said "I am the truth." The evangelical conception of historical development clearly distinguishes between truth as objectively present in Christ and in the Scriptures, and truth as subjectively present in the consciousness of the Church. Christianity in itself and objectively considered is complete in Christ in whom dwells the fulness of the Godhead bodily and who is the same yesterday, today and forever, and is recorded in the New Testament in its normative form for all time; but subjectively, Christianity, or the life of the God-man in his

Church, is a process of development from the lower to the higher. Nothing, however, can be developed unless it is contained potentially in the germ. A doctrine which has no root in the Scriptures, that is, a doctrine that is not expressed in any Scriptural passage, and is not contained in any Scriptural principle, and is not implied in any Scriptural narrative, parable, event or character, and is not by any natural inference and association of thought, suggested by any Scriptural language" such a doctrine ought never to be developed as a part of the faith of the Church.

By showing the great errors in the theological development of the past, the study of church history will guard the reader against an overvaluation of tradition and of the creeds of Christendom. The present has too often been the willing victim of the past, but a careful study of church history will enable and inspire the intelligent minister to exploit the past in the interest of advance. The work of the searcher after truth in the past should appeal to us moderns, saying, "Go and do likewise! Prove all things and hold fast to that which is true." For blind acception of traditions involves great perils. It is common to attach the greatest weight to the oldest opinion. Yet it is not correct to look for the highest wisdom in antiquity; because, as Bacon reminds us, *we are the ancients* and they who lived before us belonged to the childhood of the race. On the other hand, ideas that have stood the test of time win a certain guarantee of their solidity in comparison with raw notions, suddenly springing from the imagination of a new thinker. But that is only the case when those ideas are being constantly tested by experience and criticism; and it does not apply after tradition has become petrified and has attained the rank of a venerated idol. Tradition sometimes claims to be of divine origin, handed down in the Church from the time of the Apostles in a line of authorized teachers. The extravagant pretensions of Romanism, founded on the authority of tradition which the Council of Trent declared to be of equal value with that of Scripture, warn us against the danger of trusting such claims. Tradition may become an excuse for unfaithfulness to Divine revelation. Thus it was with the Jews, and is now with the Romanists and others.

Church History Inspires Interest in Church Union

We are living in an atmosphere of Church union, as the continuous negotiations and especially the great conferences at Stockholm and Lausanne, indicate. These union movements will be clarified and strengthened by the study of Church history, as it will inform the reader how disunion arose and where the right path to reunion lies. It will thus inspire a larger number of leading

churchmen with a stronger desire to do their bit in healing the wounds of a divided church by employing the most effective methods.

Church history reminds us that already in the Apostolic age there were various types of Christian teaching. Paul, James, Peter and John discussed their doctrinal differences and often clashed very vigorously. (Gal. 2 and Acts 15); but none of the groups, except the intolerant ultra-conservative Judaizers, demanded that the brother holding another viewpoint should be cast out from the church. They believed in an inclusive, comprehensive church.

Church history further shows how in the course of centuries the plain gospel of Christ was overlaid and burdened with the philosophies, sophistries and unintelligible disputes on the unfathomable mysteries of God's nature, in utter disregard of Paul's warning (Rom. 11: 33-36). Very soon not the plain simple Gospel of Christ, but these subtleties were emphasized and made the test of orthodoxy, and the dissenters were excommunicated on the charge of heresy. *Thus disunion and new churches arose,* like the Armenian, the Nestorian, the Coptic and other communions. Later the pope insisted on the highly speculative doctrine that the Holy Spirit proceeded not only from the Father but also from the Son ("filioque") which drove the Greek Catholic Church into separation. At the conference of Marburg in 1529 Luther and Zwingli agreed on 14½ of the 15 articles of their common Protestant faith, drawn up by Luther himself, and only on the second half of the fifteenth article concerning the mode and manner of Christ's presence in the Lord's supper they disagreed, whether it is physical (Luther) or spiritual (Zwingli) and because of this slight difference Luther refused to Zwingli the hand of fellowship, and his refusal led to the formation of the Reformed churches. Similarly in Great Britain, the Church of England insisted on the apostolic succession of their bishops, and their stubbornness finally led to the threefold division into Presbyterians, Congregationalists and Episcopalians. Still more trivial differences were the causes of the more than 150 American denominations.

But Church history also shows plainly that the way to church union lies along the lines of toleration and freedom within the churches, by soft pedaling the differences and by emphasizing the true fundamentals taught by Christ, such as living faith in God, loyalty to Christ, personal and social regeneration, universal brotherhood, the abolishment of many still existing relics of barbarism, such as war and poverty. History shows that all church unions which in the past have come about succeeded on the basis of tolera-

tion, freedom, inclusiveness and comprehensiveness, which basis long ago was succinctly expressed by St. Augustine, when he advised:

"In necessaries unitas,
In dubiis libertas,
In omnibus caritas."

For example, in 1817 the Lutheran and Reformed Churches in Prussia formed a *federated* union on the basis of liberty of belief concerning their distinctive doctrines; in 1818 these two denominations in the Palatinate (Pfalz), Baden and Hesse went still further than in Prussia and formed a *complete consensus of merging and absorptive union,* dropping even the old names, and assuming the official title: "The United Evangelical Church." Of this type of union, not of that in Prussia, our Evangelical Synod is the daughter. At present, the principle of toleration ("Gleichberechtigung der Richtungen") is fully practiced in England, Germany, Switzerland and almost all other European Churches. High, low and broad churchmen, Lutherans and Reformed, liberals and conservatives of various shades are members of one and the same synod and teach side by side in the theological faculties, not indeed in unrestrained liberty but in the spirit of wide tolerance. These different groups do indeed discuss very frankly their differences in private conferences, in numerous periodicals and even on the floor of their official synods, but very seldom is the demand heard that this or that group should be cast out of the official church. Almost all their leaders stand for a comprehensive, inclusive church, strongly believing that in the long run and with liberty of research guaranteed Christ's spirit will step by step lead His loyal followers into clearer truth. They all seem to believe in Voltaire's oft-quoted definition of toleration: "I don't believe a word of what you say, but I will defend to the last your right to say it."

Intolerance and the principle of an exclusive church breeds either discreet silence which withholds some of the best ideas from the people for fear of heresy hunting, or it leads to rebellion and more sects. It is hopeless and the height of folly to pretend to bring all men to have the same thoughts on speculations regarding the deep mysteries of religion, or to accept Episcopal Church government or to practice immersion. It is not in human nature of large groups of men, especially of the educated classes, to agree long on theological definitions. Theology is philosophy and it is characteristic of all philosophies that they are subject to great changes in the course of time. A final theology is not any more possible than a final science, or a final law or a final medicine. It

is in the very nature of the human mind to push on to further fields of inquiry. In his time Paul was considered a "new" theologian, so later was Luther.

Christian saving faith is happily a very simple matter, and is, and ever will be, outside of all theological disputes of men learned or unlearned. True faith can be secured only by living the Christ life and by earnest prayer. It is not mere belief opinion or credulity. Let us reverence the old creeds as way-marks of progress and use selected portions of them as material for the new edifice of the theological intellect, but never as stumbling blocks in the path of those who feel to say "Sirs we would see Jesus." If not all signs deceive, the spirit of union between and within most American denominations is growing. If it were not so, we would see new sects formed every year. There are enough differences of opinion within the Presbyterian, the Evangelical, the Methodist and other churches to divide each one into two or more new denominations, and the only thing that keeps them knit together is the spirit of tolerance. When in recent years the militant wing of the fundamentalists tried to force a separation within the Presbyterian and the Baptist churches, the majority, composed of liberals and conservatives, formed a *tolerationist group* and called a halt of strife on the plea that futile controversies divert the energies of faith to a deplorable degree from their real task which is saving souls. This summer's theological Union Seminary Conference broke all records for attendance. From 29 states came 298 pastors and religious workers, owing allegience to 18 denominations and representing 66 theological seminaries. Presbyterians, Methodists, Congregationalists, Baptists, Lutherans, Episcopalians and so on down the line to the Friends, Methodist Protestant, Unitarian and Hebrew. Seminaries represented were Union, Lancaster, Yale, Gettysburg, Princeton, Auburn, McCormick, Boston and Drew. A new feature was the presence of fifteen colored pastors. This shows the strength of toleration and union.

The union movement within and between denominations expects much help from our lay people. Most of them, as well as a large number of ministers, feel that in spirit and in the real fundamentals "we are not divided; all one body we, one in hope and doctrine, one in charity." Our clear-headed lay people observe that various denominations already worship and work together occasionally, in innumerable federations and union services and they wonder why this cannot be done permanently. An increasing number of business men who pay the bills of the church's extravagance also insist that the present waste in men and money and equipment should be stopped. As one said recently "Every denomination to-

day laments the dearth of its resources both of money and men. What right then have we to waste such resources as we have by expending them where they are not really needed instead of where they are. The immediate demand is not for more surveys—there have been enough of them to convince the most skeptical that in the location of our churches the various sects have been bereft of any common plan and so have drifted into an inefficiency which a business firm would never tolerate."

Pressure from without may also help in unifying the Churches. Count Hermann Keyserling has recently assured us that we stand on the threshold of the most irreligious, indeed the most anti-religious epoch of all times. We have heard much of assaults upon Christianity in Russia and China; and we must recognize an aggressive anti-Christian movement in our own country. On every university campus there are professors and students who consider the Christian faith incredible, and who lose no opportunity to pour sneering contempt upon it as a belated survival of crude superstition to be laughed out of existence as an affront to intelligence. Some magazines and publishing houses whose clientele is composed of the self-styled intelligentsia, adopt a similar attitude and carry on an insidious propaganda against Christian morality. In most communities there are groups of socially minded men and women who have come to feel that not only organized Christianity but the faith of Jesus Himself is inimical to human progress. Moreover, a strong socialistic political party will soon be due in America, whether we like it or not, and this fact also demands a united church.

Church History Inspires Love for the Social Gospel

The phrase "social gospel" is new, but not the idea for which the phrase stands. "It is a valid idea, discovered or rediscovered almost in our own time and deserving of an emphasis proportionate to the neglect which it had suffered through the preceding ages. No other phrase carries that idea so well. The implications of the idea are only beginning to be unfolded. Most of its meaning is yet to be learned. Yet there are those who curl the lip in high disdain when it is mentioned, and affect an utter weariness with a term so often reiterated. The reason is quite patent. They do not believe in the social gospel and they would discredit it by discrediting its vocabulary. If you believe that the attempt to Christianize the social order is an impertinent interference with a divinely approved status quo, or an illegitimate digression from the task of saving souls, then you will easily grow tired of hearing others speak of the social gospel, and you can fortify your hostility

to the conception which it represents by speaking scornfully, as a so-called religious paper did not so long ago, of the social gospel and such chop suey." (Christian Century.)

Beginning with Christ and His apostles, the Church has never entirely neglected her duty to fashion the world according to the social principles of Jesus, though she may often have used false methods. The Roman government persecuted the Church, not because she confessed the divine sonship of Jesus (they themselves believed in many "sons of their gods") but because the Christians insisted that Jesus was their king whose teachings should rule the Roman empire. They were pacifists on principle; they raised the standard of women, children and slaves. The forming of the Holy Roman Empire in 800 A. D. by the pope was meant to be an institution for Christianizing the social order. All the Protestant reformers even Luther, were also *social* reformers, besides their distinctively religious work. The Protestant churches of England, Germany, Switzerland and America have to their credit hosts of men and women whose life was devoted to the amelioration of social conditions like Maurice, Carlyle, Ruskin, Kingsley, Stoecker, Naumann, Shaftesbury, von Bodelschwingh, Wichern, and many others. The reading of biographies of these men will prove a tonic and will most assuredly inspire a minister to follow in their train, according to the talents received of God.

All the churches, Protestant, Catholic and Jewish, are today engaged in a tremendous and unprecedented effort to better themselves as well as society, by advance in religious education, in moral earnestness and in prophetic vision. Since Walter Rauschenbusch twenty years ago stirred up the American churches on matters of the social gospel some decided progress has been made. The literature which has developed on the relation of Christian idealism to the problems of economic and political life is voluminous. "The number of religious leaders, both clerical and lay, who have some understanding of what Christianity ought to mean in economic and social terms has been greatly increased. Institutional church, activities, if they have anything to do with the subject, have been multiplied. In problems of international morality the gain is obvious. The church has learned a lesson or two from the war. Whether or not the church is ready for heroism, should another war come, is matter for dispute; but it could not possibly be as naive as it was in the last one." (Christian Century.) All the churches have appointed social commission to keep their people informed and socially inspired. Yes, we are making some progress in recouping the losses suffered by Christian idealism centuries ago and so brilliantly analyzed by Professor Jawney in his "Religion

and the Rise of Capitalism." The very fact that there is an increasing opposition to this phase of church work on the part of the wealthy, the ultra conservative and the mis- or uniformed within and without the churches proves that the social gospel leaven is working.

Church History Furnishes Devotional and Homiletical Inspiration

The study of Church history, lastly, inspires the reader with increased devotion and consecration to Christ and his Church by bringing Him into living contact with the great men and women who in all ages have prayed and labored and sacrificed and suffered and died for the Master and his cause. They are still above us and about us, a dense cloud of witnesses, in view of whom we are exhorted to run with patience the race that is before us. History says Carlyle "is but the biography of great men." Behind every gigantic movement there is a great mind and a stout heart. The biographies of the great men introduce us into those retreats of private life where the thoughts which have ruled the world were born and developed. They also emphasize anew that the *religious life in the form of subjective piety* is the measure of the true church. The most truth is found where we have the largest amount of practical piety. We need the help of these glorified spirits; not the help of their intercessions, but the help of their example, treasured for us in the volumes of Church history to inspire us. We need them all. Not Luther or Zwingli or Calvin only, but St. Bernard and Anselm of the Middle Ages and Polycarp and St. Augustine, the saints of ancient times who had each his own word to say, his own work to do, his own battle to wage, his own victory to win; Roman saints as well as Protestant and Greek as well as Roman; out of the catacombs, the deserts, the monasteries. Wherever in any century, in any land or in any denomination there beats a heart, or is lifted a hand for Christ, let us grasp that hand, let us bless that heart. Such ample charity while it makes us none the less Protestant, will surely make us all the more Christian.

Lives of great men all remind us
  We can make our lives sublime,
And departing leave behind us,
  Footprints on the sands of time.

Footprints that perhaps another,
  Sailing o'er life's solemn main,
A forlorn and shipwrecked brother,
  Seeing, shall take heart again.

Picture to yourself the scene when the old Bishop Polycarp immediately before his martyrdom said: "Eighty-six years have I served the Lord, and He has done me nothing but good; how could I curse him who has redeemed me?" Or the scene at Worms, when Luther, with death staring him in the face declared: "Here I stand, I cannot do otherwise; God help me." Or the defense of the Heidelberg catechism before the Emperor by the Elector Frederick of the Pfalz, when he said that he would rather give up his throne than his catechism. Or the landing of the Pilgrim fathers in 1620, or the founding of Germantown by the Germans in 1683. These are telling sermon illustrations. Cold indeed and insensible, must be the student who can read these stories without being mightily aroused to emulation and powerfully inspired to greater devotion and consecration, and whose lips do not quiver with the prayer "More love to thee, O Christ, more love to thee."

Selected Bibliography

Among the many books on the foregoing subject we recommend the following:

Schaff's Church History.
Oehninger, Geschichte des Christentums.
Geschichte des Religioesen Lebens in der Deutschen Evangelischen Synode von Nord Amerika, by H. Kamphausen.
The Reformation a Liberating Force, by Philip Vollmer.
Geschichte der Evang. Synode, by Dr. Muecke.
Biographies of Luther, by P. Smith and by McGiffert.
Biographies of Calvin, by Walker and by Philip Vollmer.
Biography of Zwingli, by Jackson.
A Vital Problem of American Protestantism, by J. H. Horstmann.

PHILOSOPHY AND EDUCATION

Prof. John O. Evjen, Ph. D.

(*Concluded*)

Reciprocity of Education and Philosophy

It is unnecessary to continue our historical survey further. The influence of philosophy on education is evident everywhere. Philosophy gives, education received. And yet, philosophy would be the possession of only a few, if education did not apply its ideas concretely. Philosophy, therefore, in its turn, is indebted to education. However, since philosophy no longer retains its autocratic leadership of yore, there are now not a few educators who wish to give the leadership formerly enjoyed by philosophy over to education. Their program is to make education the center of all study. But this is fundamentally wrong. For, in the first place philosophy is stronger today than it was when it played the role of a dictator. Today it is a leader in a democracy of sciences. Formerly it was Monarch pure and simple. There is no real philosophy without science, and no science without philosophy. In the second place, education is practical. If it becomes pure theory, it will defeat its own end. Thirdly, there have been many prominent educators who have never studied pedagogy or "education" as a special discipline. Fourthly, the interest in pedagogy grows with teaching; yes, it may happen that it does not awake before one begins to teach. And lastly, it is admitted that pedagogy and didactics do not accomplish for the future teacher, even in a remote degree, what the clinical sciences do for the future physician and surgeon.

The attempt to establish an "education" aristocracy is based upon a superficial knowledge of philosophy, especially of its history, and upon a rather limited knowledge of the functions of the special sciences.

Education, instead of being on the way to a generalship, is heading, it would appear for a sergeantship, judging by much of what is passed off as education today. To borrow another figure, it is probably not too much said that we have a dangerously good supply of jazz education on the market, an uncomfortably large number of hodgepodge electives served in chautauqua style to very immature personalities. Education certainly cannot accomplish even what it did in the past, if it does not build more upon philosophy than it is doing at the present time. In fact, we are inviting Anarchy in our education, if we do not pause in our wild chase to read the signs on the road.

The Aim of Philosophy

In its nigh omnipotent days, in the days of Aristotle, philosophy covered physics, cosmology, zoology, metaphysics, ethics, psychology, politics, economics, rhetoric, poetics. Not so now. And happily, and wisely so. Its mission today is not of the extensive, but of the intensive order.

Spencer has given an interesting definition of philosophy: "Knowledge of the lowest kind," he says, "is un-unified knowledge; science is partially-unified knowledge; philosophy is completely unified knowledge." Wundt defines philosophy as the unification of all knowledge obtained by the special sciences in a consistent whole. Philosophy is also defined as the critical science of general value judgments. Külpe's definition appeals to me as the best: "Philosophy is the science of the most general principles of being, becoming, possibility, actuality, necessity." Every science speaks of conditions, laws, forces, possibilities, realities; but no single discipline can undertake a comprehensive discussion of these and similar terms. This is the business of philosophy.

The purpose, then, of philosophy is evident. It is to gain a general world and life view, which answers to the demands of our reason, and satisfies the needs of our feelings (Wundt). Therefore, that which is *general* is the object of philosophy; as the *special* is the object of history; and the *typical,* or what recures regularly or according to laws, is the object of natural science.

Man needs a philosophy. He does not live by science alone, anymore than by bread alone. He feels the need of poetry and art, of faith and religion. Besides knowledge, he wants what is soothing, what expresses itself in color and form, in music and rhythm. His feelings as well as his intellect have their needs. He feels the need of faith in himself, in his undertaking, in his people, in the future of the human race, in the final victory of the good; and he feels the need of religion—of God.

But even if he has religion, and aesthetics, and sciences, he still feels the need to reason about them and to unite them in a world view that satisfies his intellect and his heart. He needs the science of sciences, that is the systematization of sciences, whether natural-scientific, or intelectual, or moral: He needs philosophy, this science of sciences.

Every science claims a part of reality. Geometry assumes that there is space, but it leaves with philosophy the task of finding out whether there is real space, or whether space is a mere auxiliary concept. An illustration: Physics considers reality in so far as it is corporal, showing general modes and relations. Biology con-

siders processes of life in the same matter. Psychology considers this matter from another side: in so far as it is consciousness per se. But philosophy unifies all of these in order to answer the question, "What is reality?" The special sciences offer partial solutions. But philosophy, on the basis of these partial solutions, can alone give the ultimate solution. The unity that philosophy is striving to attain is a necessary thought. This is evident from the fact that all sciences have to deal with psychology and epistemology.

Philosophy, then, is dependent on all the sciences, of whatever nature they may be. And the sciences again are dependent on philosophy. Any denial of this will invite the retelling of Menenius Agrippa's story about the rebellion that the members of the human body started against the stomach as the lazy devourer of nourishment, a rebellion ending in self-defeat. It makes little difference whether philosophy is compared to a head or a stomach, a heart or a root. The comparisons, all alike, serve to show that science apart from philosophy is bound to perish. The same holds true of education. Its separation from philosophy means selfdestruction.

Fr. Paulsen has well compared philosophy to a central fire, to the sun whose life-giving, warming rays go forth to all of the sciences. A field of research is cultivatable only to the extent that it is penetrated by these rays. Anyone who digs in the ground independent of the sun's rays will harvest hard fruit, if fruit at all. A science, without contact with philosophy, will shoot forth plants of the kind that grows where no sun shines. Or to change the illustration, a system of science without philosophy is one-eyed, a Cyclops, huge and deformed, with the chances of losing whatever vision it has at the hands of a crafty Ulysses, who is bent on leaving unknown regions for better known ones.

The Antecedents of Philosophers

A philosopher cannot be a down-to-date authority in every field of science, though we have a remarkable example in Wilhelm Wundt, reminding us of the polyhistor ability of an Aristotle and a Leibniz. Wundt was at home in all of the sciences, and, as Höffding has said, "the most learned philosopher of our age." A philosopher may be a theologian, like Höffding or Heinze; or a physiologist, like Wundt or James; a physicist, like Mach; a jurist, like Leibniz or Bentham; or an economist, like John Stuart Mill. In any case he will have his feet on the ground, and not be a dreamer, lost in unreal abstractions. "All roads lead to Rome," is an old saying. All roads of science, likewise, lead to philosophy, but none through the air.

Scientific Opinions Under Revision

Philosophy, depending on the sciences, and yet claiming a dependence of its own, is especially welcome in our present age, when natural science is losing some of the philosophic sufficiency which it has been showing the last two generations. Natural science has begun to question some of the results which it long ago stamped as unchangeable and infallible. We are now told by some of the leading scientists of the world that it is just as scientific to teach that the earth stands and the sun moves, as it is to teach that the sun stands and the earth moves; in other words, that the old Ptolmaeic system is as scientifically good as the Copernican; the relativity theory compelling us to arrive at this conclusion. We are told again that the alchemists, whom the chemists and ourselves have repeatedly laughed at, were right in their theory that gold is not an element, but that they were wrong in their practice. We are further told that the same and four scores of elements that we know are probably reducible to one element; that radium changes into lead, and that lead in the course of the milleniums may turn into gold. We are no longer sure of gravitation, since Einstein told the world that a stone let go from an elevation does not fall, but remains still, being overtaken by the upwards rising earth. We are no longer sure about the existence of ether, time and space, causality, atoms and molecules. We are no longer sure that we have an infinite universe. We are no longer certain that five miles below the crust of our earth is a burning mass. In fact, we are now told that the earth is likely a solid, cold magnet ball, covered by a crust fifteen to twenty miles deep. Below this crust is a layer of fire liquid, 800 miles deep. We are no longer sure that Eucledian geometry is absolutely correct, when we hear that there is no such a thing as parallel lines, all parallel lines in this great universe of ours finally running into each other. We have dogmatism in natural sciences too. But this dogmatism is being assailed today as never before.

Metaphysical Questions

But these matters do not worry us. Questions of greater importance, answerable by metaphyciss, are the following: What is life, and what is the purpose of life? What relation have the psychical processes with the physical, especially with the brain processes that accompany them? Is earthly existence the only existence, or is there an existence beyond, as held by religion? Are the moral tasks that we assign ourselves and endeavor to realize, only of subjective importance, or is the world so disposed as to have them realized? Is there progress in historical development in the sense of growth and expansion of spiritual and human values?

Many do not concern themselves about these questions. Some are resigned, or do not care. Some are callous, or well satisfied with any authoritative answer. But some want to find the answer, and to pass it on to their fellow men. These are the metaphysicians, which that school of philosophy known as Positivism ignores, not caring for spiritual realities given in religion or anything transcendental.

Metaphysics, therefore, has some strong enemies to cope with. The attitude towards logic and epistemology is more friendly. For, logic investigates the laws of thought; epistemology investigates the nature and origin, the validity and limits of knowledge; and every science must examine its presuppositions and proceed according to laws of reasoning. The importance of epistemology and logic is therefore very evident.

Ethics and aesthetics receive a less friendly reception than do logic and epistemology. But they are not quite as much scoffed at as metaphysics.

Phychology has an established position in education that few will dispute, though it is only a matter of time when it will be rivaled by ethics and history of culture (Volkelt).

Since logic treats of Knowledge; metaphysics of Being; ethics of What-Ought-To-Be in the field of morality; and aesthetics of the laws of art, the value of philosophy for education appears self-evident—even apart from psychology. Or, to put it differently: Any educational program that stresses what is beautiful, true, and good cannot operate unless it accepts the help offered by the systematized knowledge we have in aesethetics, which treats of the beautiful; in logic which treats of the true; and in ethics which treats of the good.

I therefore maintain that the importance of philosophy for education should not be underestimated. And here I mean education in both its restricted sense, and liberal sense. Education in its liberal sense is more comprehensive than the education that a state teachers' association devotes most of its time to. This education at best hardly gets beyond the simpler problems of secondary education. Education in the larger, and really true, sense includes more than what the normal school loves to call "educational" or "professional" subjects, meaning methods, reviews, school management, practice teaching, psychology, etc. It is possible that a Harvard, Yale or Cornell alumnus, a graduate of both the undergraduate and graduate department, drifting into a normal school, may be asked how much education he has had, and be told he "has not had any education."

By education I mean the whole of education, and not a part

or phase of it. I do not identify it with the work given in the grades, or in the secondary schools, or in the normal, or even in college. I include all of this, and more. And yet I wish to emphasize that professors of education are the very people that most of all need a thorough grounding in philosophy. Many of our fads and freaks in graded school work, many of our ill-balanced curricula, much of our uniformity mania, many of our methods, savoring of license as well as the straight-jacket, ever so much of our intolerable dogmatism—hail from, or are sponsored by, professors of education, and are passed along by less mature disciples. Education has witnessed many a romantic adventure. No sooner is a man through college then he aspires for an administrative position in a high school and gets it. He has practically no knowledge of philosophy, and has had no training in a positive science like Law, Medicine or Theology, nor has he done any other graduate work. He is a theorist. If he has gotten his B.A. in the school of education, he is still a theorist, only so much more so than if he had taken his 130 semester hours in straight college work. The sudden and overwhelming enthusiasm we have lately witnessed for mental tests shows what the educationist is apt to do when his education has no roots in philosophy, or is not supported by any education derived from such old, well-developed, positive subjects as Law, Medicine or Theology. An educationist is too often like the evergreen used as a Christmas tree. This tree parades its fruits, many kinds; its sweets; its colors; it may even radiate light. But the fruits and sweets, colors and lights are borrowed; and the tree has no roots. This is the danger: the glory soon passes away.

I have had books in my hand written by professors in education—books whose authors have reminded me of the Christmas tree. One author discusses church, religion and theology. His knowledge of the subject is not first hand, hardly third hand. He has read a few books from a "liberal" camp and settles some of the most profound problems with a few sweeps of his pen. Another discusses evolution, and applies biologic evolution to man and history—where many a biologist and historian of repute would write with moderation or at least maintain a very sceptical attitude. The author I have in mind is neither a biologist nor a historian. One has "education's latest results" on hygiene, when these "latest results" may be the hypotheses of a little school which the history of medicine has shown up as exploded, generations ago. One writes on the little value of knowing foreign or classical languages, when it is apparent that he has no command of any other language than his own. One discusses law, but the well educated jurist that reads his work, shakes his head.

The educationist cannot be an expert in all branches of knowledge. Only a few educationists have had a training in medicine, as William James, Maria Montessori, Walter F. Dearborn; in Law, Alexis E. Frye, Thomas Edward Finnegan; in Theology, as A. E. Winship, George A. Coe, E. Stanley Hall, Fletcher H. Swift—and a host of foreign educators, like Wilhelm Rein, editor of the largest Encyclopedia of Education in existence; Ernst M. Roloff, editor of the most recent Encyclopedia of Education, "Lexikon der Pädagogik," in five volumes, from Catholic point of view; Ernst Meumann. But many have had—most of those mentioned above—training in philosophy, and will testify to the help they have derived from this study in their educational work. Philosophy, more than any other study, shows the interrelationship of the various branches of study, how much or how little they overlap, and the place each study has in the whole field of knowledge. It is the science of, or, perhaps better, the science *about* sciences.

The History of Teaching Philosophy

Philosophy was the concluding study of school studies until the beginning of last century, being given as propaedeutics in all colleges. Then it became a university study, attracting a lesser number of students, who were too busy with their professional studies to reason out a theory of life. It lost its prestige, and became simply a science among other sciences. Kant's system was too critical to become a school system. Then the speculative systems came, one after the other sweeping over Europe, in rapid succession, each one proclaiming war upon all of the others. This meant the falling of philosophy into disrepute. In the fifties and sixties of the last century, natural science laughing at philosophy, proudly proclaimed its system of materialism and atheism. Natural science had of course made a big headway in the practical realm, but it overstepped its boundaries when it proclaimed itself an absolute Monarch.

Something of this spirit of absolutism was manifested recently when an American association working for the advancement of science and claiming a membership of 11,000, publicly proclaimed evolution as a dogma, possibly as a rebuke to Mr. Bryan, whose arguments on evolution, it is true, have no more real weight than that of any other man, but whose challenge to evolution has a little in common with that of Professor Hans Driesch, one of our greatest present day authorities on biology and philosophy. Driesch delivered the Gifford lectures in the University of Aberdeen, Scotland, in 1907 and 1908. They were published in English; in 1921 they were revised and published under the title of

"Philosophie des Organischen," a large volume of more than 600 pages. Dr. Driesch, recently caled to the University of Leipzig to succeed W. Wundt, subjects evolution to a very sceptical treatment. Somewhere he has endorsed the saying that the evolutionist's genealogical table of man is as trustworthy as the genealogy of the Homeric Gods!

A society of 11,000 members, a great many of whom probably can claim the distinction of being scientists with no better right than a nurse can claim the distinction of being a physician, or a midwife a surgeon, has actually immitated, by going on record, the ancient ecclesiastic councils in proclaiming a dogma. This society may number some who have mocked the council that proclaimed papal infallibility. And yet what does it, itself, proclaim but a dogma: Evolutionistic infallibility?

No: evolution stands or falls before the bar of philosophy, the science of sciences, where also a thinker and expert like Driesch, thoroughly at home in biology and philosophy, has a right to be heard. Natural science is only one witness, not the entire court.

The Age of Reconstruction

We are living today in the period of philosophic reconstruction. Sciences have again learned the value of philosophy, and are themselves becoming increasingly philosophic. We notice it especially in the field of biology. However, philosophy needs a better support than we are giving it at present in order to make it safeguard our youth, who too often fall into the hands of the first best sophist that comes along with his alleged discoveries that have been exploded centuries before and discarded by philosophy, of which he is quite ignorant. It does, therefore, not surprise us that leading educators wish to have propaedeutic philosophy taught—and taught early, yes as early as in the freshman class in college (Thilly of Cornell, Woodworth of Columbia).

Teaching Philosophy in a Practical Way

Even where philosophy is not taught as a school subject, much can be done to show the young people, by giving one hour talks on the fundamental thoughts of leading philosophers, that there have been really great men who retained world views differing much from those that are sanctioned by the socalled common sense today. I think of a Plato, a Democritus, an Aristotle, a Descartes, a Spinoza, a Hume, a Leibzig, a Kant, a Fechner, a Bergson. A few hours of instruction in regard to these men would convey to students the difference between the metaphysical categories of materialism and idealism, illustrated by the thinking of Democritus and Plato; or of Theism and Pantheism, as seen in the system of Leibniz and

Spinoza. In a few periods students would get an insight into the difference between the epistemological categories of Empiricism and Rationalism, as presented in the systems of Hume and Kant; or into the difference between the ethical categoris of Hedonism and Energism, as taught by Epicurus and the Stoics.

One does not need be a philosopher by vocation to teach this, though he must be acquainted with the subject. The half of the great thinkers in the past were not teachers of philosophy, but physicians, men of literary affairs, statesmen, theologians, historians, and scientists.

The Object of Teaching Philosophy

The main object of teaching philosophy is not to give the student a definite system, but to show him how to philosophize, to draw out the thinker in him. Whether he becomes an artist or an engineer, a teacher or an attorney, he would receive benefit by acquiring an understanding of the workings of the human mind, of the laws of thought, and of the principles of conduct. And why should he not derive benefit by pursuing the branches that deal with things in which the human race has been interested from its early civilization; psychology, logic, ethics, and, not to forget, history of philosophy, which gives a knowledge of the development of man's interpretation of reality? Surely, this should insure him against accepting a one-sided, narrow world view.

The Value of Psychology for Education

Important as all of these subdivisions are, I cannot omit dwelling somewhat on psychology. Psychology has been defined as the science of the soul; again, as the science of the mind; further, as the science of consciousness; and lastly, as the science of behavior. Professor Robert S. Woodworth states in a footnote in his Psychology that "a series of waggish critics has evolved the following: 'First psychology lost its soul, then it lost its mind, then it lost consciousness; it still has behavior, of a kind.'"

Psychology deals with processes of consciousness. It is not psychology, nor is it natural science, though much of the talk we hear about "brains" and "gray matter" and "head" would permit of the inference that psychology is a branch of physiology. The very common statement that we "think with our brains"—the statement was first made some generations after the discovery of America—shows how materialistic thought has colored our language. Professor Paulson, who advocates psycho-paralellism as an explanation of the apparent interaction of body and soul, denies outright that thinking is the function of the brain. He says thinking is the function of the entire man. Thought cannot be localized, in

the brain or in any other part of the human system. The brain is no more a special repository of thoughts than is a book. We say of a book, too, that it contains thoughts. In reality it contains only printer's ink. Those who claim thought as work of the brain make psychology a part of physiology, though no physician has ever been able to find a thought in the brain. They are ignorant of the setback this manner of viewing things has received at the hands of epistemology. We must not lose sight of the fact that psychology still is occupying itself with tasks that border on the physical and psychical. In natural sciences we deal with atoms and molecules, electrons but in psychology we deal with feelings, sensations, and endeavor, or shape and structure. Psychology can as little explain the essence of soul, as mechanics the essence of energy. We grant that all soul processes are tied up with the existence of the brain and the nervous system, but we hold, nevertheless, that all soul processes are peculiar according to their essence, incomparable with bodily processes. The processes of the brain do not shed any light on higher soul life—on an act of self-conquest, of logical deduction, of artistic contemplation, or of religious faith. The peculiarity of psychic occurrence is, to use the language of Wundt, the principle of the creative resultant, or creative synthesis. In psychic life, every result is more than the sum of the factors that determine the result. There is not only constancy, but growth in psychic life; a plus, not derivable from the physical factors by themselves.

The value of psychology for education even in its narrow sense is unquestioned, though it was questioned for a time even by men like James and Münsterberg, less than a generation ago. But these men were converted to other views, both writing, later, psychologies for teachers.

Essence of Man Is Will, Not Intellect

However, not a little of the psychology lying at the foundation of our current pedagogical ideas is of the Herbartian order, which exalts the intellect as the main and original activity of man. We regret this. For, modern psychology teaches that feeling and volition are the original forms of the activity of consciousness, and that intellectual activity is a later differentiation of mental life. One need only read William Jerusalem's splendid exposition of this in his "Problems of the Secondary Teacher" (Badger, Boston, 1918), or scan the pages of the philosophical works of a Wundt, a Friedrich Paulson, or a William James to find that the essence of man is not thinking, but volition; not the Intellect, but the Will. Any doubt as to the displacement of the Intellect as the sole umpire of man's actions will disappear if one reads what France's

greatest philosopher of this century, Bergson, has to say, when he pays his tribute to Intuition as the great thing in man, and regards the "fall of man" as consisting in the dethroning of Intuition and the enthroning of Intellect. No one who accepts this theory can endorse the statement of Socrates that knowledge is virtue, i. e., that the mere knowing of what is right will lead to the doing of right. History also proves that there have been centuries where men's actions have been far ahead of their thinking. An intuitive action has often saved a cause, when reflection would have killed it. The advice, Think before you act, is sometimes illdirected.

Education Separated from Philosophy Means Inward Annihilation of Education

Education, in its restricted or "professional" (to borrow normal school currency) sense was in former times generally taught by professors of philosophy, except in our country where numerous chairs in Education have been established in recent years. But leaders in education like James and Dewey, Judd and Spaulding were thoroughly trained in philosophy.

Europe is not as rich in college and university chairs of education as is our own country. However, this does not mean that European schools cherish inferior ideals as to education. England has certainly as high ideals relative to the study of English as has America. Yet, it is said with some sarcasm that America's field of English fairly teems with professors; that Harvard has twice as many professors of English as Oxford and Cambridge combined; and that the University of Chicago has almost as many as the whole of England!

In discussing the establishment of special professorships in education in European universities, Professor Friedrich Paulsen, well known for his standing both as educator and philosopher, writes that this plan would have its good sides, if education would keep in contact with philosophy. He says: "The separation of education from philosophy would be impossible. Without psychology and ethics education would be without any roots, since ethics and psychology cannot be separated from metaphysics and epistemology. If the demand for special chairs in education means a separation from philosophy, the result would be the inward annihilation of education." Paulsen finds the best solution in adding a new chair or department of philosophy to the two older recognized ones. There is already one chair, in most of the foreign universities, for the theoretical philosophical disciplines of psychology and logic. There is another for the history of philosophy. A third and new, chair should be established for giving instruction in practical philo-

sophy. It should concern itself with education and the history of education, and extend its work to ethics and psychology, which are the presuppositions of a theory of education.

In truth, much of the faddism we are suffering under in education today is due to the educational ventures that have no roots in philosophy. Well says W. Jerusalem, philosopher and educator, "The theory of education or pedagogy is closely related to the problems of philosophy particularly with psychology on the one hand and with ethics and sociology on the other. This explains why the fundamental theories of this discipline are generally due to thinkers who have devoted much time and attention to philosophic problems . . . A far more adequate philosophic preparation should be provided for teachers than is the case at present." This is said with reference to conditions in Austria, where the study of philosophy is obligatory in every gymnasium or college. Much more does the desideratum apply to the curricula in many of our schools, where philosophy is pretty much an invisible quantity.

Education in Its Restricted Sense Faces the Same Problems as Philosophy

John Dewey, one of America's greatest philosophers, says: "Since upon Education falls the burden of securing the practical realizing and balancing of the various interests of life, the *educator faces, if only in half-conscious, unsystematic form precisely the same questions that philosophers discuss in the abstract.*"

Dewey continues: In the attitude taken to matters of hygiene, physical training, manual training, corporal punishment, etc., there will be expressed, for example, some idea of the connection, or lack of connection, of mind and body—an idea that, made explicit and fitted in with other beliefs, corresponds to some typical philosophical theory of the relation of bodily and mental action. Some practices imply that man is an external compound of body and soul, in themselves two independent forces. Others proceed on the assumption that the body is a temporary shell in which the mind is housed, or that the body is a clog upon the development of spirit. Other projects imply that only through the adequate functioning of the bodily organs can there be realized a symmetrical and sound mental life. The various theories held by philosophers as to the relation of knowledge to practice are paralleled in educational procedure. Some assume that contemplative knowledge is an end in itself; others that knowledge is a mere external prerequisite for successful action. . . . The old philosophic question as to the relation of the individual to the established objective order appears in instruction as the individual initiative and choice over against the accu-

mulated body of organized knowledge which forms the ready-made subject matter of teaching. The philosophical controversy as to the method of knowledge, with its division of camps into sensationalists and rationalists, has a counterpart in the different methods of learning that are encouraged in schools. The philosophic split between mind and physical nature corresponds to the educational antagonism of humanistic and scientific studies, which also has a genuine, even if indirect, bearing upon the philosophic issue of idealism versus realism." . . . *Philosophy may be defined as the general theory of education:* the theory of which education is the corresponding art of practice. Philosophy . . . is the idea of which a *consciously guided education* is the practical counterpart." Thus far Dewey.

Dewey seems to emphasize that philosophy originated in Athens from the direct pressure of educational questions, like the following: What is the nature of state and law? What is the true end of life? How shall man know this end? Can virtue or excellence be taught? How? Is it a matter of practice and habit, or something intellectual? What is knowledge, its standard? If virtue can be learned, how is learning related to knowledge, etc? "The fact that the stream of European philosophic thought arose out of the discussion of educational ends and means, remains an eloquent witness to the ulterior motive and purpose of philosophic reflection."

Philosophy a Requirement of Education Abroad

In Germany philosophy is necessary for anyone who wants to teach in the gymnasium, corresponding to our high school and college. Many in Germany regard some university work in philosophy as essential to a liberal education. People who study law, medicine, theology, technology regularly attend lectures in philosophy. In fact the largest class in a university like Leipzig is the one in philosophy. 300 students would enroll for a course in philosophy, where only 60 or a hundred would enroll for other, general subjects.

The Ecole Normale in France, corresponding to the very best of our teachers colleges, requires two years of philosophy from all who intend to qualify as teachers of history and literature. Additional instruction in this branch is given for those who want to teach philosophy in the secondary schools.

In Austria philosophy has been a required college subject for more than seventy-three years. Two periods a week the last two years in the college are required for logic, history of philosophy, and psychology.

In the Scandinavian countries the requirement is about the same as in Austria. Philosophy is obligatory for all who enter the university.

In Italy philosophy is required to the extent of eight semester hours, though there is clamour for more. In all of these countries philosophy is considered as a part of liberal culture.

The Need of Idealism Over Against More Recent Systems of Philsophy

A great deal of thinking today is materialistic. The object of leading philosophic systems of materialism, naturalism and positivism is merely to fix and generalize what natural sciences have achieved. Materialism understands by reality the sensuous, that which is apprehended by the senses. It holds that everything which is an object of knowledge must be conceived and interpreted as it is apprehended by the natural sciences themselves. Theoretical materialism has been refuted, but materialism is still the belief of a majority, and has a great following among teachers. Haeckel is its leading prophet, his book "The Riddle of the Universe" being the most often published, read, and translated book on philosophy in this century. Professor Friedrich Paulson said, he felt ashamed, that such a book could be written, published, sold, and read in the land of a Goethe and Schiller. The book shows an ignorance of philosophy parallel only to the ignorance it displays about church and religion. We reject the world view of materialism.

Another system to be rejected is that of naturalism, holding that man himself remains just a part of nature, and is the object of sensuous knowledge. Even the highest and most ideal thoughts and aspirations of which man is capable are regarded by naturalism only as signs of his natural constitution, only as forms of his mortal earthly destiny. Nietzsche is the prophet of naturalism, a poet rather than a philosopher, insane when he wrote his richest work, dreaming about the superman, who in the course of development should surpass the present man physically, morally and mentally, as the present man surpasses the ape or the apelike being from whom, he, according to Nietzsche, sprang!

Positivism refrains from this onesided recognition and superlative regard for natural science and for the outward sensations of reality. But it objects to speculation. It has no use for metaphysics or a world view. It cultivates philosophy only from the standpoint of logic and epistemology. Like materialism and naturalism, it wants no interpretations connected with any religious needs. It regards these interpretations as neither possible nor necessary. Positivism is a widespread philosophy, in France, Italy, Germany, England, South America, and even our own country. In Norway, Ibsen was a positivist. It proclaims the glory of our achievement when we give all honor to natural reality and do not

bother ourselves with metaphysical speculations. We reject positivism, as we do naturalism and materialism.

We need Idealism as a philosophic system. Our former American leaders in thought were idealists, as our literature was idealistic. Our days were happier when Idealism reigned than now. For now, the philosophy of Bentham and Mill has laid hold of our country, as of all other countries. It is so intelligible and appears so practical that it brushes aside its but little superior system of Positivism. It links hands with materialism.

Bentham taught the maximum of pleasure regardless of cultural status. Individual happiness was to be the goal and to be attained by material values. Bentham's system, reinforced by the teachings of John Stuart Mill, means a harsh unlimited individualism, a cold egoistic ultilitarianism.

Spencer is the most consistent prophet of this kind of utilitarianism. He made the aim of education as "complete living." By this he means life here on earth alone. That education has anything to do with religion, or that it is of any, even remote importance for any life hereafter, does not worry this utilitarian. Spencer is the father of evolutionistic psychology. In fact he applied evolution to all of the sciences, his teaching being the most influential exponent of that theory today. According to his view, good is that which promotes the self-preservation of the individual and of the groups; bad is what retards it. This is utilitarianism of the clearest water. Morality he bases on inherited experience; and conscience he regards merely as organized experience.

What this shallow teaching means to education and culture is easily seen. And yet it controls the most favored educational policies of our country. Spencer's system has been ably combatted by English philosophers like Th. Green, Bradley and Martineau, who finds the solution of the riddle of the universe in Theism. But their voices are not heard, not even in our own country. We offer too much incense at the altars of Pragmatism, that school of philosophy, sponsored by James and Dewey, which judges truth according to its consequences, according to its value for knowledge and life—which really is nothing but another way of applying the criterion, "Does it pay?" Interesting as James is, he never got beyond agnosticism. And inspiring as Dewey is, he never felt the need of metaphysics.

One of the telling comments of late times on our philosophical and educational status is the popularity of Well's "History of the World," which is for history what Haeckel's "Riddle of the Universe" is for philosophy. Well's mind, so productive of fiction in the past, has not lost any of its fiction-portraying power in this

book, which is a compilation of facts arrayed and interpreted by the philosophy of positivism and utilitarianism, entertaining as a Punch and Judy show, but as different from real history as such a show is from a classic presentation of a Shakespearean play or an Ibsenian drama.

We need more ethical idealism in our philosophy and more idealism among the philosophers who are in a position to wield an influence on education. Idealism does not measure up to religion, but it helps to pave the way for religion, without which man is only half a man, only partially prepared for complete living.

And Idealism is coming. It is returning to Europe. President Burton's plea for religion as a part of education, at the National Educational Association meeting at Atlantic City a few years ago; and Frank Spaulding's criticism of the "Does-it-pay" motive, at the Chicago meeting of the same Association, are indications of an approaching Idealism. Idealism is returning to philosophy. That guarantees also its return to Education, in the wider as well as the narrower sense.

Die Geschichte der deutschen Theologie seit Schleiermacher.

Von Prof. Dr. R. H. Grützmacher.

I.

Schleiermacher.

Wie in der Geschichte überhaupt, so hinterläßt auch in der Geschichte der Theologie jede wirklich lebendige Macht ihre Spuren bis zur Gegenwart. Die christliche Theologie hat manche Beeinflussungen in der Formulierung ihrer Wahrheiten durch vor- und außerchristliche Philosophie empfangen. Die Kirchenväter standen besonders unter dem Einfluß des Platonismus und des Neuplatonismus, die mittelalterlichen und zum Teil auch die altprotestantischen Theologen unter denen des Aristoteles. Aber der eigentliche Gehalt der christlichen Theologie wurde doch stets durch die Bibel bestimmt, jedoch mit dem Unterschied, daß bald die alttestamentlichen Bestandteile, bald ein Paulus oder Johannes oder auch die drei ersten Evangelien am stärksten wirkten. In der protestantischen Theologie löste naturgemäß die Lebens- und Ideenwelt der Reformatoren die kräftigste Nachfolge aus, hier mehr Luthers geniale Intuitionen, dort mehr die geschlossene Systematik Kalvins. Selbst die Epigonen-Theologie des ausgehenden sechzehnten und des ganzen siebzehnten Jahrhunderts ist immer wieder repristiniert worden. Der Pietismus brachte eine religiöse Vertiefung, die in der Theologie ihr Echo in der Betonung der lebendigen Erfahrung dauernd fand. Der Rationalismus nötigte die moralischen Konsequenzen der christlichen Weltanschauung schärfer herauszuarbeiten.

Alle diese theologischen Richtungen haben ihre Spuren bei dem Begründer der neueren protestantischen Theologie **Schleiermacher** hinterlassen. In ihm lebt ein Stück Platonismus wieder auf. Die Heilige Schrift, sonderlich in ihren Johanneischen Bestandteilen ist ihm Urquell. Die reformierte Dogmatik wird in einer Reihe seiner Lehren lebendig. Aus dem Pietismus stammt seine Gefühlsreligion. Der Rationalismus nötigte ihn das sittliche Ziel des Christentums besonders zu betonen. Aus allen diesen verschiedenen Zuflüssen gelang es aber Schleiermacher einen neuen Strom zu schaffen, sodaß er mit Recht am Anfang derjenigen theologischen Bewegungen steht, welche das neunzehnte Jahrhundert ausfüllten und auch in der Gegenwart noch fortwirkten. Infolgedessen hat ein Ueberblick über die Haupttypen der protestantischen Thelogie des neunzehnten und zwanzigsten Jahrhunderts in Deutschland, der in dieser Zeitschrift dargeboten werden soll, mit ihm zu beginnen. Während I. **Schleiermacher** für sich steht und keine Schule im engeren Sinne des Wortes gebildet hat, entstehen nach ihm in sich geschlossene Gruppen: II. **Die altliberale Theologie,** III. **Die konfessionelle und positive**

Vermittlungstheologie, IV. **Die Ritschlsche Theologie**, V. **Die religionsgeschichtliche Theologie** und VI. **Die Theologie der Gegenwart**, die sich mehr in einzelne Erscheinungen auflöst.

1.

Schleiermachers Persönlichkeit.

D. F. Schleiermacher wurde am 21. November 1768 als der Sohn eines reformierten Feldpredigers geboren, und bekam dadurch von Hause aus eine Neigung für die reformierte Konfession. Mit 15 Jahren kam er in die Erziehungsanstalten der Herrenhuter. Die dort vertretene warme gefühlsmäßige Frömmigkeit wie die christozentrische Blut- und Wundentheologie machte auf ihn einen starken Eindruck, sodaß er sich auch später noch als einen „Herrenhuter höherer Ordnung" bezeichnete. Sodann aber regte sich bei ihm ein scharfer kritischer Sinn, der ihn zu tiefgehenden Zweifeln an dem überlieferten Christentum führte. Auf der Universität Halle vertiefte er sich in alle geistigen Strömungen seiner Zeit, besonders auch in Kant, mit dem er sich aber doch dauernd innerlich nicht befreunden konnte. Stärker dagegen beeinflußte ihn Plato, dessen Uebersetzer er später wurde, und von neueren Philosophen besonders Spinoza, dem er eine Locke zu opfern forderte. Aber stärker noch als die strenge Philosophie beeinflußte ihn die neu aufkommende künstlerische Romantik. Mit einem ihrer Hauptvertreter Schlegel lebte er eine zeitlang nicht nur äußerlich, sondern auch innerlich eng zusammen. Seine ganze Weltanschauung und Lebenshaltung gewann einen starken Anflug des romantischen Aesthetizismus, sodaß er Religion und Kunst nach Form und Inhalt einander möglichst zu nähern suchte.

Nach Absolvierung seiner theologischen Examina und einer Hauslehrerstelle in einer vornehmen Familie, wurde er von 1796 bis 1802 Prediger an dem großen Krankenhaus der Charite in Berlin, geriet aber hier so stark in die Berliner Strömungen hinein, daß er selbst in das „Exil" eines kleinen pommerschen Städtchen für einige Jahre ging. 1804 wurde er als Professor nach Halle berufen, las dort über fast alle theologischen Fächer. Da er sich an der Vorbereitung der nationalen Erhebung durch seine Predigten beteiligt hatte, mußte er Halle verlassen, als dieses unter französische Herrschaft kam. Er wurde in Berlin Prediger an der Dreifaltigkeitskirche und 1810 auch Professor an der neugegründeten Universität. In diesem sehr arbeitsreichen Doppelamt des Praktikers und Theoretikers, das aber seinem innersten Wesen entsprach, blieb er sein ganzes Leben. Er übte eine außerordentlich erfolgreiche Tätigkeit als Professor wie als Prediger, griff in alle kirchlichen Fragen ein, wie die von ihm warm begrüßte Union und die Neugestaltung der von ihm kritisch beurteilten königlichen Agende. Ende Januar 1834

erkrankte er und offenbarte in seiner letzten Stunde mit besondrer Deutlichkeit die charakteristischen Züge seines inneren Wesens. Er begehrte das Abendmahl zu feiern und sagte nach der Rezitation der Einsetzungsworte: „Auf diesen Worten der Schrift beharre ich, sie sind das Fundament meines Glaubens." Aber da ihm der Arzt den Wein verboten hatte, feierte er das Mahl mit Brot und Wasser — gläubig an das Wort von der Versöhnung, aber frei und kritisch gegenüber der äußeren Form seiner Darbietung. Dann sagte er noch: „Ich muß die tiefsten spekulativen Gedanken denken und sie sind mir völlig eins mit den innigsten religiösen Empfindungen." Dieser Verbindung von Frömmigkeit und Spekulation unter Wahrung ihrer beiderseitigen Eigenart hatte sein ganzes Schaffen gegolten.

2.

Die Reden über die Religion!

Im Jahre 1799 ließ Schleiermacher zunächst anonym eine Schrift erscheinen: „Ueber die Religion, Reden an die Gebildeten unter ihren Verächtern." Einleitend bezeichnet er es als seine Absicht zu den gebildeten Deutschen, die im Unterschied zu Engländern und Franzosen die Religion verachten, von den „heiligen Mysterien der Menschheit" aus seiner persönlichen Erfahrung heraus zu reden. Die Religion nennt im seelischen Leben eine besondre Provinz ihr eigen, die getrennt liegt von dem reflektiven Denken und dem moralischen Handeln: „Ihr **Wesen** ist weder Denken noch Handeln, sondern Anschauung und Gefühl." Diese Anschauung ist ein unmittelbares Schauen, das vom Blick auf die Natur und die Menschheit aus geht, dann aber das ganze „Universum" mit der Phantasie erfaßt. „Anschauung des Universums ist die allgemeine und höchste Formel der Religion." Den Begriff des Universums ersetzt Schleiermacher durch eine ganze Reihe andrer Ausdrücke wie „das Eine und Ganze, das Unendliche im Endlichen sich darstellend, das Himmlische, das ewige und heilige Schicksal, die ewige Vorsehung, die lebendige Gottheit." Dagegen lehnt Schleiermacher die Erhebung des Universums zu einem persönlichen Gott als eigentlichem Gegenstand der Religion ab; ja er kennt sogar Religion ohne Gott. „Wenn ihr nun nicht leugnen könnt, daß sich die Idee von Gott zu jeder Anschauung des Universums bequemt, so müßt ihr auch zugeben, daß eine Religion ohne Gott besser sein kann, als eine andre mit Gott." Schleiermacher vertritt in der ersten Auflage seiner Reden eine durchaus immanent pantheistische Religiosität. Denn auch der Glaube an sein persönliches individuelles Fortleben im Jenseits gehört nicht zum Wesen echter Religion. Vielmehr gilt: „Mitten in der Endlichkeit eins werden mit dem Unendlichen und ewig sein in jedem Augenblick, das ist die Unsterblichkeit der Religion."

Die fromme Anschauung des Universums ist von einem Gefühl begleitet und zwar von einem solchen der Abhängigkeit und Bedingtheit des Individiums durch das Universum. Das Universum ist der aktive Faktor, der im religiösen Menschen eine „kindliche Passivität erzeugt: „Religiöse Gefühle sind Erfurcht vor dem Ewigen und Unsichtbaren, Demut und Dankbarkeit, Freude, Zuversicht und Vertrauen. Im Grund bestimmt Schleiermacher ähnlich wie die Bibel und die Reformation das subjektive Wesen der Religion als Fürchten und Lieben. In ihnen aber sieht er die Hauptsache in der Religion, so daß diese einen subjektivistischen Charakter gewinnt und eigentlich nur noch Psychologie ist. Sodann erhält die Religiosität bei Schleiermacher — im Anschluß an Griechentum und Romantik — einen stark ästhetischen, plastisch-musikalischen Charakter. Sie wird zum mystischen Genuß, der auf klare Erkenntnis und sittliches Handeln verzichtet. Schleiermacher bereitet jene Religiosität vor, wie sie sich im neunzehnten und zwanzigsten Jahrhundert nicht selten findet und bei der das Theater — etwa durch das Bühnenweihfestspiel R. Wagners — die religiösen Stimmungen und den kirchlichen Kultus ersetzt.

In der dritten Rede spricht Schleiermacher über die **„Anlage zur Religion,"** die jeder Mensch besitzt, die sich aber in den religiösen Helden, Virtuosen, Mitteln besonders kräftig verwirklicht. In der vierten Rede handelt Schleiermacher über **„das Gesellige in der Religion** oder über Kirche und Priestertum." Die Religion schafft das vollendetste Resultat der menschlichen Geselligkeit, „eine Akademie von Priestern, einen Chor von Freunden, einen Bund von Brüdern." Diese ist freilich vollkommen verschieden von der empirischen Kirche, deren tiefgehende religiöse Mängel vor allen Dingen auf ihre Verbindung mit dem Staat zurückgehen. „Hinweg also mit jeder solcher Verbindung zwischen Kirche und Staat."

Die fünfte Rede, die von besonderer Bedeutung ist, erörtert unter dem Titel **„Ueber die Religionen"** das religionsgeschichtliche Problem und die Stellung des Christentums innerhalb der Religionsgeschichte. Obwohl Schleiermacher die Religion zu der natürlichen Anlage eines jeden Menschen rechnet, lehnt er doch die Existenz einer allgemeinen natürlichen, überall identischen Religion im Sinn des Rationalismus und von Lessings Nathan ab. Die Religion hat sich vielmehr geschichtlich von jeher in bestimmten positiven Einzelreligionen individualisiert, deren Eigenart es zu bestimmen gilt. Schleiermacher beschränkt sich auf das Judentum und das Christentum. Im Judentum tritt wesentlich der Gegensatz und die Reaktion des Unendlichen gegen das Endliche hervor. Auch im **Christentum** wird zunächst die Disharmonie wehmütig empfunden, dann aber ihre erlösende Vermittlung behauptet. „Das Verderben und die Erlösung, die Feindschaft und die Vermittlung, das sind die

beiden unzertrennlich miteinander verbundenen Seiten dieser Anschauung." Diese Vermittlung vollzieht sich in **Jesus** in dessen Seele sich die Idee ausbildete, „daß alles Endliche höherer Vermittlungen bedarf um mit der Gottheit zusammen zu kommen." Jesus selbst besitzt diese echte Religiosität und hat die Fähigkeit, sie andern mitzuteilen; er besitzt darum das Bewußtsein, ein Mittler zwischen Gott und den Menschen zu sein. Aber Christus hat nie behauptet der einzige Mittler zu sein, sodaß auch das Christentum nicht als „die einzige Gestalt der Religion in der Menschheit allein herrschen kann." — Mit der Behauptung, daß alle Religion nicht als natürliche, sondern nur in geschichtlich positiver Form besteht, wie in der Verbindung des Wesens des Christentums mit dem Mittleramt Jesu, bewegt sich Schleiermacher in der Linie des Altprotestantismus. Dagegen bahnt seine mehr philosophische als religiös-ethische Wesensbestimmung und vor allem die Aufgabe der religionsgeschichtlichen Absolutheit des Christentums und Christi neuprotestantische und moderne Ideen an.

3.

Schleiermachers Auffassung der Theologie.

Sein wissenschaftlich theologisches Programm entfaltet Schleiermacher in seinem wesentlich aus Thesen bestehenden Büchlein „Kurze Darstellung des theologischen Studiums," 1811. **Er bestimmt hier sowohl das Wesen der Theologie als Wissenschaft, wie den Zusammenhang und die Aufgabe der einzelnen theologischen Disziplinen.** Die Theologie soll nicht eine besondre Wissenschaft sein aus theoretischen Gründen, sondern nur durch ihre praktische Abzweckung auf die Leitung der Kirche. „Die christliche Theologie ist der Inbegriff derjenigen wissenschaftlichen Kenntnisse und Kunstregeln, ohne deren Besitz und Gebrauch eine zusammenstimmende Leitung der christlichen Kirche, das heißt ein christliches Kirchenregiment, nicht möglich ist." Die Theologie ist im Grunde danach nur eine kirchliche Technik und infolgedessen die „praktische Theologie die Krone des theologischen Studiums." Auf der andern Seite allerdings fordert Schleiermacher eine **philosophische Theologie,** die ihren Ausgangspunkt über und vor dem Christentum nimmt. Wir würden heute von Religionsphilosophie reden. Diese bestimmt von sich aus, unabhängig vom christlichen Glauben, alle entscheidenden Begriffe des Christentums und der Kirche nach ihrem Wesens und Wahrheitsgehalt. Die innertheologischen Disziplinen der Dogmatik und Ethik haben mit den entscheidenden Wahrheitsfragen nichts zu tun, sondern nur den tatsächlich bestehenden Glaubens- und Sittlichkeitsbestand zu schildern. „Die zusammenhängende Darstellung der Lehre, wie sie zu einer gegebenen Zeit geltend ist, bezeichnen wir durch den Ausdruck Dogmatik." — Durch die Aufgabe der wissenschaftlichen Selbständigkeit der Theologie und ihre Abhängigkeit von einer

philosophischen Theologie hat Schleiermacher die neuprotestantische Umwandlung der Theologie in Religionsphilosophie angebahnt und das Christentum in seinem Wahrheitsgehalt von allgemeinen Spekulationen abhängig gemacht. In der Betonung der praktischen Abzweckung hat zwar Schleiermacher an die kirchliche Zielsetzung der Altprotestantischen Theologie angeknüpft und auch einen im anglo-amerikanischen Kulturkreis weit verbreiteten theologischen Typus vorbereitet; aber er hat doch auch dadurch den Ernst und die Selbständigkeit der Wahrheitsfrage gefährdet.

Die religiöse und wissenschaftliche Auffassung vom Christentum, wie sie bisher geschildert wurde, hat Schleiermacher vereinigt und ausgeführt in: **„Der christliche Glaube** nach den Grundsätzen der evangelischen Kirche im Zusammenhang dargestellt." (1821—22.) **Dieses Buch ist die berühmteste und einflußreichste Dogmatik der gesamten neueren Theologie geworden.** Die Sprache ist nicht mehr romantisch wie in den „Reden," aber auch nicht mehr so knapp wie in der „Kurzen Darstellung," sondern dialektisch durchgeführt, jedes einzelne Wort durch seinen Zusammenhang in einem besonderen Sinn bestimmt. — Die entscheidenden Prinzipien für die christliche Glaubenslehre werden auch hier andern, außer- und übertheologischen Wissenschaften entnommen, so der „Ethik," einer Art soziologischer Geschichtsphilosophie, und der Religionsphilosophie. Aehnlich wie in den Reden wird zunächst die **Frömmigkeit** bestimmt als eine Bestimmtheit des Gefühles und zwar eines Gefühles, „daß wir uns unserer selbst als **schlechthin abhängig** oder was dasselbe sagen will als in Beziehung mit Gott bewußt sind." Dieses Gefühl steht im Gegensatz zu jedem Freiheitsgefühl, das wir gegenüber der Welt haben. Das „Woher" dieser Abhängigkeit nennen wir Gott, den wir zunächst nur in diesem Gefühl selbst und nicht als eine außerhalb seiner bestehende und es hervorrufende Größe haben. Streng genommen hat die Dogmatik allein diese fromme Gemütszustände darzustellen. „Christliche Glaubenssätze sind Auffassungen frommer Gemütszustände." Nur als ein Zugeständnis an die traditionelle Auffassung bezeichnet es Schleiermacher, wenn er auch in seiner Dogmatik diesen subjektiv psychologischen Aussagen noch objektiv geschichtliche oder metaphysische Sätze über Eigenschaften Gottes wie über Beschaffenheiten der Welt folgen läßt. **Schleiermacher hält mithin auch in der Glaubenslehre an seiner wesentlich subjektiv religionspsychologischen Behandlung des Christentums fest.** Für ihn steht der Mensch mit seinen frommen Gefühlen im Mittelpunkt und nicht Gott mit seinem Handeln. Gott ist noch immer stark pantheistisch gedacht. Schleiermacher ist und bleibt der Anfänger einer religionspsychologischen, anthropozentrischen, pantheisierenden Richtung in der neueren Dogmatik.

Im Unterschied zu diesen Gedankengängen vollzieht Schleier-

macher eine gewisse Wendung zur Geschichte und Methaphysik in der **Definition des Christentums.** Auch in der Glaubenslehre wird jene durch den Vergleich mit der Definition andrer frommer Gemeinschaften gewonnen. Unterscheidungs- und zugleich Wertmaßstab für die verschiedenen Religionen ist das Verhältnis zwischen Natürlichem und Sittlichem. Eine Religion, die auf Sittlichkeit als ihr Telos hinzielt, gehört der „teleologischen Richtung der Frömmigkeit" an. Die spezifische Eigenart des Christentums besteht jedoch erst in der religiösen Beziehung auf Christus und die von ihm ausgehende Erlösung. So kommt denn die berühmte Definition des Christentums in §11 der Glaubenslehre zustande: „Das Christentum ist eine der teleologischen Richtung der Frömmigkeit angehörige monotheistische Glaubensweise und unterscheidet sich von andern wesentlich dadurch, daß alles in derselben bezogen wird auf die von Jesus von Nazareth vollbrachte Erlösung." Im Unterschied zum Rationalismus einschließlich der Gedankenwelt eines Kant, für den Jesus nur Lehrer und Vorbild oder gar nur geschichtsloses Idealbild sittlichen Lebens war, bekennt sich Schleiermacher hier im Sinn der Bibel und der Reformation zu dem geschichtlichen Jesus als Erlöser. **Er bahnt damit die christozentrische Richtung in der positiven Theologie des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts an.**

In der speziellen Ausführung der Dogmatik wie in der Sündenlehre, der Christologie und Soteriologie vollzieht allerdings Schleiermacher noch sehr starke Umdeutungen und Verflüchtigungen, die zum guten Teil durch griechische, platonische Vorstellungen beeinflußt sind. Die **Sünde** ist nur der positive Widerstreit der Sinnlichkeit wider den Geist, wodurch dieser an der Verwirklichung seines Gottesbewußtseins gehindert wird. „Sünde ist eine durch die Selbständigkeit der sinnlichen Funktionen verursachte Hemmung der bestimmenden Macht des Geistes. Wir sind uns der Sünde bewußt als der Kraft und des Werkes einer Zeit, in welcher die Richtung auf das Gottesbewußtsein noch nicht hervorgetreten war." Die Sünde ist mithin nicht — reformatorisch — in erster Linie der willenmäßige Gegensatz zu Gott, sondern eine Disharmonie zwischen den verschiedenen Kräften des Menschen, die ein Hervortreten des Gottesbewußtseins hemmen. Infolgedessen handelt es sich auch bei der **Erlösung** nur um eine subjektive Beeinflussung des Menschen. Seine seelischen Hemmungen werden beseitigt, dadurch sein Gottesbewußtsein gestärkt und seine Seligkeitsempfindung gekräftigt: „Der Erlöser nimmt die Gläubigen in die Kräftigkeit seines Gottesbewußtseins auf und das ist seine erlösende Tätigkeit. Der Erlöser nimmt die Gläubigen auf in die Gemeinschaft seiner ungetrübten Seligkeit und dies ist seine versöhnende Tätigkeit." Die Vergebung der Schuld dagegen und erst recht die objektive Versöhnung mit Gott treten fast ganz zurück. Nicht Gott ändert sein

Verhalten, sondern nur das menschliche Verhältnis zu Gott wird geändert und zwar so, daß erst aus der sittlichen Umgestaltung eine neue religiöse Beziehung erwächst: „Das Aufgenommenwerden in die Lebensgemeinschaft mit Christo ist als verändertes Verhältnis des Menschen zu Gott betrachtet, seine **Rechtfertigung** als veränderte Lebensform betrachtet seine **Bekehrung**. Infolgedessen werden auch die historischen und metaphysischen Lebenszüge im Bild Christi fast ganz gestrichen. Die sogenannten **Heilstatsachen** fallen als dogmatisch gleichgültig dahin: „Die Tatsachen der Auferstehung und der Himmelfahrt Christi sowie die Vorhersagung seiner Wiederkunft zum Gericht, können nicht als eigentliche Bestandteile der Lehre von seiner Person aufgestellt werden."

Der **Person Christi** jedoch bemüht sich Schleiermacher eine besondre Stellung anzuweisen. Seine Menschheit unterscheidet sich dadurch, daß er nicht nur zufällig, sondern wesentlich unsündlich ist und „auf keine Weise irgendwann erlösungsbedürftig gedacht, daher auch, wie die allgemeine Stimme aussagt, ursprünglich von allen andern Menschen unterschieden und mit erlösender Kraft von seiner Geburt aus ausgestattet ist. Infolgedessen wird auch seine ganze Persönlichkeit nicht aus seiner Umwelt erklärt, sondern er als eine Neuschöpfung des Menschen, als ein zweiter Adam verstanden. „Sein eigentümlicher geistiger Gehalt kann nicht aus dem Gehalt des menschlichen Lebenskreises, dem er angehörte, erklärt werden, sondern nur aus der allgemeinen Quelle des geistigen Lebens durch einen schöpferischen göttlichen Akt, in welchem sich als einem absolut größtem der Begriff des Menschen als Subjekt des Gottesbewußtseins vollendet." Schleiermacher möchte auch als Ersatz der Lehre von der Gottheit Christi ihn in eine möglichst enge Verbindung mit Gott bringen, gelangt doch aber nicht weiter als bis zu der Behauptung, „daß die stetige Kräftigkeit seines Gottesbewußtseins" mit einem eigentlichen Sein Gottes in ihm identifiziert wird. Eine wirkliche Menschwerdung Gottes in Christus konnte Schleiermacher nicht behaupten, da er ihre Voraussetzung die **Dreieinigkeitslehre** in Gott völlig umgestaltet. Er behandelt sie erst am Schluß seiner Dogmatik und zwar andeutend in der Richtung, daß er die kirchliche Vorstellung durch die des Sabellius wiederersetzen möchte, nach welcher der eine Gott in der Geschichte nur verschiedene Offenbarungsformeln angenommen hat. Er erklärt: „Da wir diese Lehre um so weniger für abgeschlossen halten können als sie bei der Feststellung der evangelischen Kirche keine neue Bearbeitung erfahren hat, so muß ihr noch eine auf ihre ersten Anfänge zurückgehende Umgestaltung bevorstehen." Ebenso ablehnend wie gegen die in der Trinitätslehre zum Ausdruck kommenden Methaphysik verhält sich Schleiermacher auch gegen eine wirklich transzendente Ausgestaltung der **Eschatologie**. Er

behauptet darum, daß „den kirchlichen Lehren von den letzten Dingen nicht der gleiche Wert kann beigelegt werden."

So bemüht sich Schleiermacher in seiner Glaubenslehre stetig um einen Kompromiß zwischen den überlieferten methaphysischen und geschichtlichen Bestandteilen des Christentums und seiner subjektivistischen und psychologischen pantheisierenden und modernisierenden Weltanschauung. Schleiermachers Glaubenslehre ist fraglos durch seine **Philosophie** stark bestimmt, wenn er das auch selbst — allerdings nicht mit voller Ueberzeugung — zu bestreiten sucht. Sagt er doch einmal: „Meinem eigenen philosophischen Dilektantismus würde ich keinen Einfluß auf den Inhalt der Glaubenslehre gestattet haben. Wie es mir mit diesem Vorsatz gelungen ist, das freilich ist eine andre Frage." Schleiermachers wirkliches Ideal ist doch die Verbindung der Philosophie mit der Frömmigkeit, des Christentums mit der Wissenschaft. Seine größte Furcht für die Zukunft kommt darum in der Frage zum Ausdruck: „Soll der Knoten der Geschichte so ausgehen, das Christentum mit der Barbarei und die Wissenschaft mit dem Unglauben?"

4.

Schleiermachers Ethik.

Ist für Schleiermacher das Christentum ethische Erlösungsreligion so hat für ihn die Ethik eine besondre Bedeutung. Aber auch seine christliche Ethik ist sehr stark bedingt durch seine allgemein „humane." Ihre Prinzipien hat er ausgesprochen in den **„Monologen"** (1801) dem Seitenstück — auch in der romantischen Sprache — zu den „Reden." Ausgeführt hat er sie in den aus dem Nachlaß herausgegebenen **„Entwurf eines Systems der Sittenlehre"** (1835). Auch die christliche Ethik liegt nur in einem aus dem Nachlaß herausgegebenen Kollegheft **„Die christliche Sitte"** (1843) vor. Gegenstand der sittlichen Beobachtung ist der innere Mensch in seiner Freiheit. Ist für die Religion das Abhängigkeitsgefühl grundlegend, so in der Ethik das Bewußtsein der Freiheit. Im Innersten der eigenen Persönlichkeit erfaßt der einzelne Mensch zugleich die Menschheit. Darum ist ethische Aufgabe sowohl **Ausbildung der eigenen Individualität, wie die liebende Verbindung mit der Menschheit.** „Immermehr zu werden was ich bin, das ist mein einziger Wille; jede Handlung ist eine besondre Entwicklung dieses einen Willens. Keine Bildung ohne Liebe, und ohne eigene Bildung keine Vollendung in der Liebe." Die Verwirklichung dieses Ideals schafft ewige Jugend noch im Alter, so daß Schleiermacher das griechische Ideal der Jugend mit dem alttestamentlichen im Greis verbindet. „Das habe ich ergriffen und lasse es nimmer und so seh ich lächelnd schwinden der Augen Licht, und keimen das weiße Haar zwischen den blonden Locken. Nichts was geschehen kann,

mag mir das Herz beklemmen, frisch bleibt der Puls des inneren Lebens bis in den Tod." Die Hauptform der sozialen Verbindung sind die Freundschaft und die Ehe.

Während er in der philosophischen Ethik die Einteilung in Güter, Pflichten, Tugenden zugrunde legt, läßt er in der christlichen Ethik, das von Gott empfangene neue Leben darstellen und wirksam verbreiten. „Sie wird die Darstellung der durch die Gemeinschaft mit Christo, dem Erlöser, bedingten Gemeinschaft mit Gott sein müssen, sofern dieselbe das Motiv aller Handlungen des Christen ist; sie wird nichts sein können, als eine Beschreibung derjenigen Handlungsweise, welche aus der Herrschaft des christlich bestimmten religiösen Selbstbewußtseins entsteht." Das darstellende Handeln trägt stark kultisch-ästetischen Charakter. Bei dem wirksamen Handeln folgt auf die Reinigung eine Verbreitung des christlichen Geistes in der Natur. Hier erst kommt die spezifische Eigentümlichkeit der Schleiermacherschen Sittenlehre zum klaren Durchbruch. Das Christentum hat die natürliche Entwicklung von allen Hemmungen zu befreien und sich mit ihr so zu vermählen, daß eine christliche Kultur entsteht. „Das was wir Geist nennen im allgemein menschlichen Sinne und was Pneuma im christlichen ist etwas wesentlich zusammengehöriges. Das Pneuma ist nur eine höhere Entwicklung von dem was wir Vernunft nennen. Es ist kein absoluter Gegensatz zwischen Natur und Gnade." Die asketischen weltgegensätzlichen Züge der christlichen Ethik treten fast vollständig zu gunsten der positiven innerweltlichen zurück. Schleiermachers ganze Neigung gehört der **christlichen Kultur, der christlichen Welt.** Er knüpft damit mehr als an das Urchristentum an die Tendenz des Katholizismus zu einer christlichen Einheitskultur an und bereitet den Gedanken einer neuprotestantischen Kulturethik vor, die dann unter seinen Anregungen zunächst R. Rothe ausgeführt hat.

5.

Schleiermachers Bedeutung.

Schleiermachers geschichtliche Bedeutung ist über allen Zweifel erhaben. Alle Richtungen des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts haben entweder positiv von ihm gelernt oder sich wenigstens negativ mit ihm auseinandergesetzt. **Die äußerste Rechte wie die äußerste Linke in Theologie und Philosophie haben ihn am schärfsten abgelehnt.** Ein Theologe wie Philippi bekämpft Schleiermacher ununterbrochen in seiner Glaubenslehre — insofern nicht mit Unrecht, als neuerdings ein ganz anders denkender Theologe, H. Stephan, feststellen mußte: Schleiermacher hat die Theologie an Luther vorbeigeführt. Auf der Linken hat D. F. Strauß in den Spuren Hegels, der sich auch persönlich mit Schleiermacher durchaus nicht stand, seine Glaubenslehre um ihres vermittelnden Charakters willen aufs schärfste

verspottet. Nietzsche geht noch einen Schritt weiter, wenn er von Schleiermachers „Zerblasenheit" redet und sagt: „Wer an der Hegelei und Schleiermacherei erkrankt ist, wird nie wieder ganz kuriert." Die andern Richtungen verbinden Anerkennung und Kritik. Die Erlanger Theologen, wie Hofmann und Frank erkennen bei Schleiermacher den psychologischen Ausgangspunkt an, tadeln aber, daß er nicht zur Geschichte und Metaphysik vorgedrungen ist, und Sünde, Erlösung, Rechtfertigung bei ihm ungedeutet sind. Ritschl wird von der starken Betonung des ethischen Elementes angezogen, findet aber zuviel Psychologie und Mystik bei Schleiermacher. Wesentlich positiver ist die Stellung der religionsgeschichtlichen Theologie und Troelsch meinte, daß man auf den Grundlagen Schleiermachers weiterbauen müsse, wenn auch kaum ein Stein des darauf von Schleiermacher errichteten Gebäudes noch stehen bleiben dürfte. Eine Reihe der neuesten Theologen wenden sich wieder scharf gegen Schleiermacher. Schäder macht ihm den Vorwurf, daß er das theozentrische Element aus der Religion entfernt habe, zugunsten des antropozentrischen. Ein Theologe aus dem Kreis Barths, Brunner, nennt ihn sogar den „theologischen Paganini" und fordert einen absoluten Bruch mit Schleiermachers Theologie.

All diesen verschiedenen Urteilen gegenüber wird man zu sagen haben, daß Schleiermacher der **Anfänger** der neueren Theologie bleibt, der ihr religiös wie wissenschaftlich in der neueren Geisteswelt erfolgreich Bahn gebrochen hat und ohne den sie überhaupt nicht existierte. Auf der andern Seite wird man ebenso bestimmt zu betonen haben, daß seine Theologie eben nur einen Anfang, eine Brücke, einen Uebergang darstellt, aber noch keinen Abschluß. Man darf darum bei Schleiermacher nicht verharren, geschweige denn zu ihm zurückkehren, sondern man muß an ihn anknüpfen, um über ihn fortzuschreiten.

Die „Religion Jesu."

Von Prof. Dr. W. Baur.

(Fortsetzung.)

5. Jesus und das Himmelreich.

Der Hintergrund. Die kurzen Sätze bei Markus und Matthäus, die wie die Ankündigung eines Programms klingen, legen es uns nahe, zunächst den Hintergrund zu malen, von dem sich Jesu Worte deutlich abheben.

„Die Zeit ist erfüllt." Wenn wir dieses von Markus überlieferte Worte verstehen wollen, müssen wir bei Lukas eine Anleihe machen. Dieser Evangelist zeigt uns anschaulich, wie und was Jesus predigte. Er las in der Synagoge zu Nazareth aus dem Propheten Jesaja: „Der Geist des Herrn ist auf mir, weil der Herr mich gesalbt hat, um die sich ihm Beugenden mit froher Botschaft zu erfreuen; er hat mich gesandt, die zu verbinden, die am Herzen verwundet sind; zu verkünden den Gefangenen Freiheit und den Gebundenen Entfesselung; zu verkünden das Gnadenjahr des Herrn und den Rachetag unsers Gottes; zu trösten alle Traurigen." Aus Jesajas 58, 6 fügt unser Text (der griechische) noch hinzu: „Und den Zerschlagenen, daß sie frei und ledig sein sollen," und mit Lev. 25, 10 hängt zusammen: „Und zu verkündigen das angenehme Jahr des Herrn."

Indem Jesus nach Verlesung des Abschnittes behauptet: „Heute ist diese Schrift erfüllt vor euren Ohren," weist er damit auf die (mit ihm angebrochene) neue Zeit hin, als die Erfüllung alter Prophetenworte. Es ist die Wende der Zeiten: Nun muß sich „alles, alles wenden." Ich, der Helfer, bin ja da: Das gehört zum Hintergrund. Der Nachweis, wie sich das mit Jesu „Religion" vereinigen läßt, bleibt denen überlassen, die der Meinung sind, Jesus selbst gehöre nicht in das von ihm gepredigte Evangelium hinein.

„Das Königreich Gottes ist herbeigekommen." Was bei Matthäus das Königreich des Himmels genannt wird, heißt bei Markus und Lukas das Königreich Gottes. Jesus wird das Reich bald mit dem einen, bald mit dem andern Ausdruck bezeichnet haben. In beiden Fällen ist seine Art als überirdische festgelegt. Es ist nicht menschlicher, überhaupt nicht irdischer Herkunft. Es ist aber jetzt da: Wie mag der Prediger das gemeint haben? Soll es heißen: Jetzt herrscht Gott auf Erden? Das müßte dann, wenn mit Jesus die Wende der Zeiten gekommen war, heißen: Darin besteht die neue Zeit, daß jetzt Gott auf Erden herrscht. Das ist doch abzuweisen; auch in dieser Form: Von jetzt an soll Gottes Willen die Menschen regieren. Vielmehr stoßen wir auch hier wieder auf den Hintergrund: Mit mir und in mir ist das Reich Gottes in die

irdische Erscheinung getreten. Darum gilt: Von jetzt an ist eine einzigartige Möglichkeit gegeben, Gottes Willen zu erkennen und zu verwirklichen.

„Aendert eure Gesinnung." Lukas, der jene programmartigen Sätze nicht hat, erzählt uns von der Predigt Jesu in Nazareth. Aus ihr geht hervor, daß Jesus von der neuen Zeit (Gnadenjahr) redete; es fehlt aber die Aufforderung zur Sinnesänderung, oder sie klingt nur schwach durch, indem von dem Rachetag Gottes die Rede ist. Die Botschaft von der Erlösung überwiegt. Doch daß dies nur die eine Seite der Predigt Jesu (das „süße Evangelium") war, zeigt sich darin, daß auf den Freudentaumel der Nazarener die harte Ankündigung folgt: „Ihr werdet freilich zu mir sagen" usw. Jetzt kam der Umschwung; mit der Freude war es aus; Zorn und Mordlust erfüllt die Herzen. Denn die frommen und patriotischen Nazarener wollten ihren alten Sinn nicht fahren lassen, ihr böses Herz nicht ändern. Und doch hat Jesus die Forderung der Sinnesänderung auf das Genaueste mit seiner Freudenbotschaft verknüpft. Hier schauen wir einen Hintergrund andrer Art; hinter Jesu schwebt das süße Geheimnis der Ueberwelt, das aber zugleich ein heiliges ist; hinter den Menschen dehnt sich ein böser Abgrund, dessen Dünste ihren Sinn umnebeln und ihr Herz vergiften, so daß die frohe Botschaft ohne den Ernst der Sinnesänderung einem furchtbaren Mißverständnis ausgesetzt ist.

„Und glaubet an das Evangelium." Die frohe Botschaft meldet eine erstaunliche Wendung der Zeit zum Guten, und ihr jesajanischer Wortlaut, verbunden mit der Zusicherung: „Heute ist diese Schrift erfüllt vor euren Ohren," mußte ja die Nazarener mit jauchzender Freude erfüllen; in kürzester Frist sind da alte Hoffnungen wieder aufgelebt, Hoffnungen politischer, sozialer und religiöser Art; aber wie geistlos und irdisch sie waren, zeigt das schließliche Verhalten jener Zuhörer Jesu gegenüber. Da ist es denn wichtig, daß Markus uns das Wort vom Glauben aufbewahrt hat. Wenn Jesus die Menschen zum Glauben mahnt, dann ist das doch ein Beweis dafür, daß er selbst an die Möglichkeit glaubt, daß die Menschen zum Glauben kommen; und in dieser Aufforderung liegt bereits eine Beihilfe zum Glauben für alle die, die Jesu gegenüber etwas von dem Hintergrund ahnen. Dieser Umstand weist darauf hin, daß in den Menschen selbst ein Anknüpfungspunkt für Jesu Predigt liegen müsse; auch dies gehört mit zum Hintergrund.

Zusammenfassend dürfen wir sagen: Hinter der Reichspredigt steht der Prediger selbst, der doch mehr ist als nur „Die Stimme eines Rufenden"; durch seine Worte wirkt die Kraft des Redenden, der die neue Zeit herbeiführt, in dem und mit dem das Gottesreich in Welt und Zeit eintritt und der, dem bösen Hintergrund gegenüber, sowohl Sinnesänderung verlangt als auch Glauben

erwartet, also auch das Gute schaut, so schwach es auch dem Bösen gegenüber auftritt.

Der Reichskönig. Hier kommen wir mit der „Religion" Jesu nicht mehr durch. Auf der einen Seite redet er von dem Reich Gottes, bezeichnet also Gott als den Reichskönig; auf der andern nimmt er für sich selbst eine Autorität in Anspruch und schreibt sich eine Stellung zu, die mit Gottes Stellung und Autorität zu rivalieren scheinen.

Es ist schon auffallend, daß Jesus sich nicht ohne weiteres mit den andern Menschen zusammenschließt, so zum Beispiel in der Bergpredigt: „Euer himmlischer Vater." Dies fällt besonders ins Gewicht, wenn man die Vorliebe bedenkt, mit der er sich selbst als des Menschen Sohn bezeichnet. Warum vermeidet er da die Redensart: unser himmlischer Vater? Dazu kommt, daß er schon als Zwölfjähriger verwundert fragt: „Wisset ihr nicht, daß ich sein muß in dem, das meines Vaters ist?" Damit meint er ja Gott, den er also als seinen Vater ganz besonders für sich in Anspruch nimmt. In einem wichtigen Punkt stellt er sich allen andern durchaus entgegen: „Ihr, die ihr doch arg seid."

Jesus tritt mit großer Sicherheit auf und mit ganz außergewöhnlicher Autorität; er behauptet von seinen Worten, sie würden Himmel und Erde überdauern. Seine Auslegung des väterlichen Gesetzes sei die allein richtige, ebenso seine Anschauung vom Sabbath, obwohl sie der herrschenden auf das Schärfste widerspricht. Er stellt sich über Mose, Jonah, Elias, David und Salomo; er verlangt, die Menschen müßten die natürliche Zuneigung zu den Blutsverwandten hinter die Liebe zu ihm zurücktreten lassen; wer überhaupt nicht ausdrücklich auf seine Seite sich schlage, sei sein Feind, und wie es solchen Leuten gehe, lassen Sprüche wie dieser erkennen: „Wer mich verleugnet" usw. Ja, er bringt ein zukünftiges Gericht in engen Zusammenhang mit seiner Person; er selbst werde in den Wolken des Himmels kommen mit großer Macht und Herrlichkeit. Er werde dann einem jeglichen vergelten nach seinen Werken. Zugrundegehen müsse, wer seinen Worten nicht nachlebe, wer ihn nur mit den Lippen bekenne, wer sogar in seinem Namen große Taten getan hätte, wenn er nämlich versäumte, den Willen seines himmlischen Vaters zu tun. Solche Menschen würden als Uebeltäter von ihm verstoßen werden. Umgekehrt sei jeder, der den Willen Gottes tue, ihm (Jesu) verwandt.

Darum vergleicht er sich den Menschen gegenüber mit einem Bräutigam. Wer ihn habe, brauche nicht zu fasten. Er rief alle von der Last des Lebens Niedergebeugten, alle von seinen Nöten Umgetriebenen zu sich, damit sie bei ihm Ausspannung und Ruhe fänden, und er vergibt sogar Sünden. Seine Aufgabe bestehe darin, die Sünder zur Buße zu rufen und das Verlorene zu retten, ja

seine Seele, das heißt sein Leben, seine eigene Person für die Rettung vieler einzusetzen und hinzugeben, also ganz in ihrem Dienst aufzugehen, bis in den Tod hinein.

Zunächst handle es sich freilich darum, guten Samen auszustreuen, das heißt die Erkenntnis des wahren Gottes und seines Willens zu verbreiten und sich selber den Seelen anzupreisen, damit sie glauben und also nicht verloren gehen. Wer so ihn, Jesum, aufnehme, der nehme den auf, der ihn gesandt habe, das heißt Gott. Damit beansprucht er eine zwischen Gott und den Menschen vermittelnde Stellung. Außer ihm kennten nur die den Vater, denen er zu solcher Erkenntnis verholfen habe. Alle Dinge seien ihm vom Vater übergeben.

Dabei gab sich Jesus keiner Täuschung hin: Nicht alle würden sich retten lassen. So kann er sogar sagen, er sei gekommen, um das Schwert unter die Menschen zu senden. Damit weist er auf seine kritische Bedeutung hin; sein Wort müsse unter den Menschen rumoren und eine tiefgehende Spaltung verursachen.

Es ist gar kein Zweifel: Jesus hat von sich als dem Messias und Sohn Gottes gesprochen; er bekennt sich zu Petri Bekenntnis und läßt in den letzten Unterredungen mit seinen Gegnern durchblicken, er sei der Messias und Davids Herr; vor dem ganzen Volk erklärt er, es habe nur einen Meister, nämlich den Messias, womit er sich selbst meinte. In der Passahzeit setzt er das heilige Abendmahl ein, wobei er Worte spricht, die diese Handlung für immer auf die feierlichste Weise mit seiner Person und seinem Werk verknüpfen; er versichert den Petrus seiner wirksamen Fürbitte, beschwört im Gericht seines Volkes seine Messianität und prophezeit sein Kommen in Herrlichkeit, unbeschadet der andern Verheißung, er werde bei seinen Jüngern sein allezeit. Er behauptet, ihm sei im Himmel und auf Erden alle Gewalt gegeben, und darum sollten die Jünger in alle Welt hinausgehen, lehren und taufen. Im Taufbefehl verknüpft er seinen Namen auf das Engste mit dem des Vaters, beziehungsweise dem des Heiligen Geistes, und im Gleichnis vom Endgericht spricht er deutlich von sich selbst als dem Gerichtskönig, der das ewige Geschick der Menschen zu entscheiden habe.

So hat sich also Jesus auf eine Weise, die vielen Menschen höchst anstößig und ärgerlich ist (darum nicht von Menschen erfunden) mit Gott, dem König des Reiches, zusammengeschlossen. Hat er sich Gott gleich gesetzt? Man denke noch einmal an das schon angeführte Wort: „Wer mich aufnimmt, der nimmt den auf, der mich gesandt hat." Und nun kommt wieder etwas Ueberraschendes: Jesus behauptet ausdrücklich, sein himmlischer Vater habe allein das Recht, die Ehrenstellen im Reich Gottes zu vergeben; der Vater allein wisse die Stunde des Weltunterganges, und dem Willen Gottes habe sich jeder zu unterwerfen — auch der Sohn? Er hat

es jedenfalls getan: „Nicht mein, sondern dein Wille geschehe." Das ist das Grundgesetz im Gottesreich, wie es sich dort überall im Leben ausgeprägt, wo die Reichsgesinnung zu finden ist.

Die Reichsgesinnung. Will man ein Jünger Jesu werden, so muß man sich selbst und die nächsten Anverwandten, ja alle Menschen und alles in gewissem Sinne hassen, das heißt verleugnen, insofern nämlich allem irdischen die Sünde anklebt. Dann aber bekommt man die Kraft zu binden und zu lösen; man hat die rechte Urteilskraft inbezug auf die ewigen Dinge und kann in Jesu Sinn und Namen handeln. Wer sich selbst verleugnet und alles, was ihn von Gott trennt, der hat ihm gegenüber die rechte Stellung gewonnen, so daß nun Vergebung und Glaube möglich wird, aber immer im Zusammenhang mit Jesus. Jetzt gilt: „Wer euch höret, der höret mich und wer euch aufnimmt, der nimmt mich auf." Solche Menschen sind die wahren Wohltäter, die wahren Herrscher der Welt; sie herrschen durch Dienen, durch werktätige Liebe. Ihre Namen sind im Himmel angeschrieben. Ihnen sind als Gläubigen alle Dinge möglich, und mit ihnen schließt sich Jesus zum Beispiel in dem Spruch zusammen: „Wer nicht wider uns ist, der ist für uns." Solange die Welt, das heißt alle die Menschen, die noch nicht Jünger Jesu geworden sind, diese in Ruhe lassen, dienen sie, ohne das gerade zu wissen und zu wollen, den Zwecken des Reiches Gottes.

Endlich ein Wort aus Jesu Mund für das Vorhandensein des Gewissens: „Warum richtet ihr nicht von euch selber, was recht ist?" Hierzu nehmen wir die Wertschätzung des Kindlichen vonseiten Jesu und seine Hinweisung auf das Licht in uns, womit neben der Offenbarung besonders die Vernunft gemeint ist. Diese drei Dinge: Kindlicher Sinn, Vernunft und Gewissen sind Anknüpfungspunkte für den Uebergang in die Jüngerschaft; trotz der Sünde ist im Menschen noch etwas, an das Jesus sich wenden kann. Es ist ein Appell an die kindliche Güte des Menschen, sowie an ihr Gefühl für Recht und Unrecht, ein Appell an das Licht der Menschenvernunft, wenn Jesus sie zur Sinnesänderung aufruft.

Die Sinnesänderung. Da die Menschen arg, das heißt schlecht sind, also Sünder, so dürfen sie nicht bleiben, wie sie sind. Sie müssen von ihrem alten Sinn lassen, der als Unglaube und Weltliebe dem Willen Gottes, der uns retten und beseligen will, widerspricht. Man muß sich selbst und die Welt verleugnen, das heißt das Recht auf die Existenz absprechen, damit man die Wurzel der Sünde abschneidet, nämlich den auf sich, den Menschen, und die Welt gerichteten Sinn. Was Jesus hier fordert, wird uns sofort klar, wenn wir untersuchen, wie er sich zu den zwei Grundtrieben des Menschen stellte, dem Selbsterhaltungs- und dem Gattungstrieb.

Wenn Jesus verlangt: „Ihr sollt euch nicht Schätze sammeln

auf Erden," so fragt es sich, ob er diesen wuchtigen Schlag gegen den Selbsterhaltungstrieb in der Meinung tut, es habe doch keinen Wert, das dem Tod verfallene Leben zu erhalten. Das ist jedoch ausgeschlossen; denn er setzt hinzu: „Sammelt euch aber Schätze im Himmel." Damit ist also ausgesprochen, daß das irdische Leben trotz seiner Vergänglichkeit (oder wegen ihr) ausgenützt werden kann und soll mit Rücksicht auf das himmlische Leben. Abgesehen davon hat es keinen vernünftigen Sinn und keinen bleibenden Wert. Der Schnitt, den Jesus hier macht, geht tief und tut weh. Hier gibt es keinen Kompromiß: „Ihr könnt nicht Gott dienen und dem Mammon." Wer sein (sinnlich-selbstsüchtiges) Leben sucht, muß es verlieren.

So wenig Jesus den Selbstmord anrät, ebenso wenig verlangt er geschlechtliche Enthaltsamkeit. Er besteht aber, wie wir schon einmal erwähnt haben, auf der Unverletzlichkeit der monogamischen Ehe und rechnet die Hurerei kurzerhand zu den bösen Dingen, die aus dem menschlichen Herzen stammen. Das Elend sitzt im Herzen: „Wer ein Eheweib ansieht, ihrer zu begehren" usw. Kinder sind wahrhaftig ein Gottessegen; denn ihrer ist das Himmelreich; aber die populäre Meinung, man könne nicht enthaltsam leben, widerlegt er durch den Hinweis auf jene, die sich um des Himmelreiches willen verschnitten haben, wie auch durch sein eigen Beispiel.

Zusammenfassend können wir sagen: Einerlei ob man im Stand der Ehe lebt oder ehelos, das irdische Leben hat (das gilt auch für das Schätzesammeln) seinen Schwerpunkt im himmlischen. Darnach richtet man sich bei der Sinnesänderung; das kann man aber ohne Glauben nicht vollbringen.

Der Glaube. Worte und Taten Jesu zielten auf den Glauben. Glauben haben bedeutet aber im Sinn Jesu Verzicht auf die eigene Kraft und vertrauensvolle Hingabe an Gott (und seinen Gesandten, den Jesum von Nazareth; hier weist die „Religion" Jesu wieder über sich hinaus). In den einzelnen Fällen zeigt sich eine Fülle von Eigenart. Kannst du, willst du mit mir ein Leben in Entbehrung führen, ohne ein eigenes Dach über dem Kopf zu haben? Oder: Halte dich nicht damit auf, deinem Vater die letzte Ehre zu erweisen. Oder: Schaue dich nicht mehr um, wenn du deine Hand an den Pflug gelegt hast. Wer nicht mit mir ist, ist wider mich: Es gilt eine große Scheidung und Entscheidung; anders gibt es keinen Glauben.

Diese ist überall dort (für Jesum), für Gott gefallen, wo sich echte Demut und aufrichtige Hingabe an ihn findet. Darum lobte Jesus den Hauptmann zu Kapernaum, der sich ebenso unter Jesu Autorität beugte, wie er Aehnliches von seinen Knechten und Untergebenen verlangte, nämlich, daß sie sich ihm, ihrem Vorgesetzten, unterstellten.

In andern Fällen führte Jesus eine Krisis herbei: Dem Gichtbrüchigen vergibt er die Sünden, und der war doch nicht zu diesem Zweck herbeigeschafft worden. Er murrt nicht; so bestand er die Probe. „Es ist nicht fein, daß man den Kindern das Brot nehme" usw. „Ja, Herr, aber doch" usw.: Das Weiblein hat sich ganz unter Jesum gestellt, und das „aber doch" war nicht Anmaßung, sondern Glaube; aus Not und Mutterliebe geboren, bewährte er sich in der Demut und kindlicher Zuversicht.

Merkwürdig ist die Art, wie Jesus den Jüngern auf ihre Bitte hin den Glauben stärkt. Er verlangt das den Menschen Unmögliche und bekämpft die Meinung, als wäre Gott uns etwas schuldig. Also: Erwarte von Gott das den Menschen Unmögliche und diene ihm mit demütigem Herzen. Von hier aus ist bis zur Liebe nur ein kleiner Schritt.

Die Liebe. Ehe die Menschen Gott lieben können, müssen ihre Sünden vergeben sein, und da Gott ihr Vorbild, ja ihr Vater ist, so kann von ihnen auch die Feindesliebe erwartet werden. Die Liebe zu Gott schließt alle Liebe in sich; sie ist die lebendige Grundlage der Gesetzeserfüllung nach ihren beiden Seiten hin: Gott und dem Nächsten gegenüber. Das Maß der Liebe zum Nächsten ist die Liebe zur eigenen Persönlichkeit, das heißt wir sollen unsern Nächsten ebenso innig lieben, wie uns selbst, und auf ebendieselbe Weise, das heißt unsre Liebe zu uns selbst ist auch ein Muster für die Art und Weise, in der wir den andern lieben sollen: „Alles, das ihr wollt, daß euch die Leute tun sollen, so tut ihnen auch."

Sofern aber an allen Sünde ist, und darum die Gefahr der falschen Liebe, der Abgötterei, besteht, gilt das Wort: „Wer Vater oder Mutter usw. mehr liebt als mich (!), ist mein nicht wert." Wer sich gar Jesu und seiner Worte schämt, der wird am Ende, wenn er in seiner Herrlichkeit offenbar wird, selbst zuschanden werden (hier kommen wir mit der „Religion" Jesu wahrhaftig nicht mehr durch). Treues Festhalten an Jesu und seinem Wort, Richtung des Herzens auf das Ewige, das Reich Gottes, und wachsamer Sinn, der sich in gewissenhaftem Tun des göttlichen Willens bewährt, mit einem Wort: Das Leben in Hoffnung der Vollendung, das allein bewahrt vor einem Ende in Schmach und Schande.

Die Hoffnung. Sie ist wesentlich der auf das Jenseits (die Ueberwelt) gerichtete Sinn. Insofern, als das Reich Gottes noch nicht vollendet ist, geht sie freilich auf die Zukunft. Insofern jedoch (mit Jesus!) das Ewige bereits in die zeitliche Erscheinung getreten ist, hat sie eine ausgesprochene Bedeutung für die Gegenwart: Sie sieht über das Aermliche der Jetztzeit hinweg und hilft darüber hinweg, immer in der Gewißheit der Vollendung und im Blick auf die Verantwortung. Darum kann der irdische Sinn sie nur mißverstehen als schwärmerischen Optimismus, oder aber er verachtet

sie in resigniertem Pessimismus. Jesus selbst weiß, daß die von ihm ausgestreute Saat zur Reife gelangen werde, und der Blick auf das irdische Ende seines Lebens in Not und Tod hat ihn nie davon abgehalten, gerade dieses Ende zu suchen; aber leicht ist es ihm nicht geworden. Er hat die Kosten gewissenhaft zum Voraus überschlagen und dabei auch für seine Jünger gesorgt.

So hat es die Hoffnung mit dem Ewigen zu tun, das in der Zeit verwirklicht werden soll, doch ohne seine Eigenart zu verlieren. So allein kann das Reich Gottes die Welt überwinden, ja, was noch mehr heißen will, die Welt verklären.

Das Reich selbst. Es fehlen weder der Predigt Jesu vom Reich noch diesem selbst die Anknüpfungspunkte. Wir haben gesehen, wie er in seiner Bibel lebte und zuhause war, wie er seine eigene Persönlichkeit entfaltete in stetem Zusammenhang mit Gottes geoffenbartem Wort. Der Schauplatz dieser Entfaltung ist die alltägliche Wirklichkeit. Hier findet er auch die Anknüpfungspunkte für das Himmelreich. Er sucht und findet Menschen, die sich unter Gott (und ihn) stellen. Sie sind wesentlich Menschen, die des Lebens Not und Betrug erfahren haben und sich nach etwas Besserem sehnen; es sind die Verachteten, die Unglücklichen, die Bescheidenen, die Entbehrenden usw.; sie sind recht eigentlich die Hoffnung der Welt. Sobald sie den Anschluß an Jesum gefunden haben, sind sie das Salz der Erde, das Licht der Welt. Sie sind die Empfänglichen, die Jesu gegenüber ihr Herz nicht verstocken, der gute Same, die Kinder des Reiches. Sie sind die Einfältigen, deren Augen nicht zugleich nach dem Irdischen und dem Ewigen schielen. Sie, deren Seelen unter der Last des Lebens sich abarbeiten; sie, die Gott gegenüber (gerade auch im öffentlichen Gottesdienst) nur an ihre Sünde und Unwürdigkeit denken; sie, die durch Gottes Güte in die Buße geführt werden — sie werden sofort hellhörig, wenn sie Jesu Reichspredigt vernehmen.

Und die andern? Es scheint, als wären sie einfach die Verworfenen, denen Gott selbst den Weg in das Reich verrammelt hätte. Aber in Wirklichkeit liegen die Dinge nicht so einfach. Wir finden, wie wir bereits betont haben, bei Jesus den Appell an die den Menschen möglichen Güte, die Vatergüte, den Kindessinn, Vernunft und Gewissen. Das finstere Geheimnis der menschlichen Schlechtigkeit vermag dem Prediger das Gute im Menschen nicht zuzudecken. Vernunft und Gewissen sind Jesu nicht einfach abstrakte Begriffe oder Dinge, die dem Menschen in religiöser Hinsicht kurzerhand abzusprechen wären, lebendige Anlagen, ohne die der Mensch nicht Mensch ist. Freilich, was haben wir daraus gemacht, daß er uns im Bausch und Bogen mit dem Zeugnis „Arg" beschämen muß! Auch kennt Jesus wohl den kosmischen Zusammenhang der Dinge; denn er redet ohne Zögern und Entschuldigung vom Teufel.

Wir haben bereits darauf hingewiesen, wie hoch Jesus die Menschenseele einschätzt. Gott ist unser Vater: Darin liegt unsre Würde begründet, die uns hoch über alle andern Lebewesen hinaushebt. Darum legt er auf den kindlichen Sinn ein solch großes Gewicht; in ihm hat das Reich seinen ganz großen Anknüpfungspunkt.

Die angemessene Wertschätzung des individuellen Menschenlebens (mit Einschluß des Weibes und des Kindes) sind wichtige Merkmale der Reichspredigt; daraus folgt, wie man mit seinem Nächsten umgeht und ihn behandelt, das ist eine Sache, die direkte Bedeutung für das Reich Gottes hat. Damit ist eigentlich ausgedrückt, daß Religion und Politik im tiefsten Grund zusammengehören. Und doch kennt Jesus den Riß, der gerade auch in diesem Stück durch unser Leben hindurchgeht: „Ihr könnet nicht Gott und dem Mammon dienen." Er kennt den Betrug des Reichtums und weigert sich als Richter oder Erbschlichter zu fungieren. Die Reichen können nur schwer in das Reich eingehen; es hilft da nur ein Mittel: Die Treue im rechten Gebrauch der Güter und des Geldes. Wer nicht einmal mit dem Geld recht umgehen kann, wer also im Kleinen, im Irdischen, nicht treu ist, wie soll dem Gott das Größere, das Himmelreich, anvertrauen.

Der sogenannte weltliche Staat, in dem unsre Finanzwirtschaft zusammengefaßt und garantiert ist, wird von Jesus nur milde und beiläufig kritisiert („So soll es bei euch nicht sein," siehe weiter unten). Wie gewaltig greift er dagegen die geistliche Obrigkeit an. Aber die heidnische hatte kein Messiasideal, noch dazu ein verweltlichtes; sie allein hätte ihn auch nicht gekreuzigt. Der Schaden für Gottes Reich war in „Gottes Volk" angerichtet, und hiefür waren seine Führer und Beamte verantwortlich, die von einem irdischen Reich träumten in fleischlichem Wohlergehen und weltlicher Macht und Pracht. Darum hat Jesus alle Kirchenpolitik dieser Art für immer verurteilt. Im Weltreich lebt man, um zu sterben; im Gottes reich stirbt man, um zu leben.

(Schluß folgt.)

EDITORIALS

October 27, 1927.

To the Editor:

The drift toward unification of Protestantism is unmistakable. While no church union embracing all denominations is in sight there has been a considerable consolidation of smaller denominations. If this tendency continues what will be the position of our Synod in the future?

It is now ten years ago that three Lutheran bodies united to form the United Lutheran church. That union absorbed one body, the General Synod, which was probably closer to us in religious feeling than any other church body. The temper of the General synod is no longer evident in the United Lutheran church. Some years ago there was some thought in a few circles of our church about the possibility of union with the United Lutheran church. There has been no evidence of such interest in late years. The United Lutheran church is a progressive church with tremendous energy, but its spirit is illiberal. Hundreds of our pastors and congregations would never find it possible to join this group.

The only other group remaining with which we have any common heritage is the *Reformed church.* Its membership is drawn from the same kind of people as our own and its whole temper is very similar to our own. Never as Calvinistic as the Presbyterian churches there is now so little to divide us from a group such as the Reformed people that there is no justification for separate establishments. The Reformed church may in time be drawn into a Presbyterian reunion. It might in fact prefer such a union, to one with us. But there is no certainty that it would. At least there are some elements in the church which would most certainly prefer a union with us. At least there would be no harm in occasional informal conversations between unofficial representatives to explore each others minds.

A *union* with *the Reformed church* would create a denomination of some six hundred thousand communicants. A denomination of this size could carry on its missionary and educational tasks with much less waste than our respective denominations under present conditions. There would be more than this advantage in union however. A union of the two churches would bring fresh life and inspiration to both parties. It would result in a denomination which could make a real contribution to American church life.

Perhaps the idea is a wild one. When suggested some years ago by the present writer in the pages of this magazine it was hailed with derision. There is good reason however to believe that the present temper of the church is not so unsympathetic toward the proposal. At any rate the "Magazine" might render a real service to the church by exploring the problem of union and inviting the opinion of the ministers of the synod upon it.

R. Niebuhr.

THE CONFESSIONAL PARAGRAPH AT THE GENERAL CONFERENCE

The special General Conference of October last adopted the Confessional Paragraph in the somewhat remodeled form suggested by the Revision Committee. The changes of this committee had to do only with the language and arrangement of the paragraph. They aimed to give its rather involved sentences greater simplicity and clarity; they did not affect its theology at all.

Still it could not be said that this change in phraseology was all that anybody wanted. There was noticeable a distinct undercurrent of opinion which would have liked to go further. If nothing was accomplished along this line it was not because no one felt the desire of a change but because few, if any, knew exactly what to propose. The point where some had a vague idea that a revision might be advisable was where the confessional paragraph "acknowledges the symbolical books of the Lutheran and Reformed churches" and mentions "the Augsburg Confession, Luther's and the Heidelberg Catechism" by name. This seems to limit us to the adherents of the two churches named and to raise a barrier against members of other churches that might want to join with us or whom we might try to win.

The Confessional Paragraph, so it is said, reflects a historical situation that was found in Prussia 100 years ago, and is still there, and a situation which our fathers in the faith faced, 85 years ago, when they transplanted the Prussian Union church on to American soil, but it is not the situation our church is confronted with today. As long as our language was German, our approach might naturally be only to the members of the two communions that flourished in Germany. Since, however, our church has become almost wholly English, or is getting to be so, we must adjust ourselves to new conditions and get ready for greater tasks. We cannot confine ourselves any more to either Lutherans or Reformed:

we ought to be willing, and even eager, to receive any applicant who sees in Christ his Redeemer, be he Congregationalist, Disciple, Episcopalian, or what not.

We, so goes the argument, are the church that of all American communions ought to stress the union idea most emphatically, for we adopted a union platform when no one else had yet thought of it. The tendency of the churches to get together is a triumph of the principle upheld by our fathers. Our union, indeed, was one of Lutherans and Reformed only, but if a common church has room for these two main branches of the Reformation movement, why not for others? For us now to hesitate to take the larger view would be a case of arrested development and might cost us whatever advantage the foresight of our fathers, or providential circumstances, have gained for us.

And if such enlargement of program is our present policy, why not indicate it in our confessional paragraph? Reflections like these were contained in the President General's report to the district conference of last year. One or two districts, at least, felt induced to take a step in this direction by moving that, after the clause in the paragraph "acknowledges the symbolical books of the Lutheran and Reformed" be inserted, "and other Protestant bodies." Other districts have been slow to suggest changes in this respect, nor has the revision committee proposed any. Doubtless the insertion of "and other churches" (or bodies) would be most unfortunate, on account of its indefiniteness. One would at once ask, *what* other churches? Certainly, not all churches would be included. Therefore, only a clearcut statement could serve the purpose. In a confessional paragraph there is no room for hazy, ambiguous generalities.

But, so we ask, if instead of "other churches," we said "all other churches acknowledging Christ, the Son of God, as their Redeemer," would that be an improvement on the old paragraph and more in harmony with present-day policy? The answer is not as easy as it might seem. For instance, Baptists and Disciples might fall in that category but they reject Infant Baptism and it would hardly do to unite in one church pedo-baptists and anti-pedo-baptists. Among the believers in Infant Baptism we have the Methodists, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Episcopalians, to mention only the larger bodies. It would scarcely be desirable to enumerate these by name in the Confessional Paragraph, for such enumeration would ipso facto be an exclusion of all the others. Besides, since the paragraph records our agreement with the Lutherans *and* the *Reformed,* the churches mentioned are included for they are branches of the Reformed Church. And our Confessional Para-

graph has in the past never been an obstacle to our receiving individual members from other Protestant churches.

There is another thing which must not be lost sight of in this connection. We must remember we have a *Catechism.* This catechism is a product of the Union spirit, it is a combination of Lutheran and Reformed elements, the Lutheran strain preponderating. If we, in the teaching of the young, use this textbook, it takes no notice of Methodists, Presbyterians and so forth. It raises even, in some respects, the bars against the inflowing of foreign elements. It has a definite teaching on the atonement while the American churches, being mostly without confessional authorities, are subject to every shifting wind of doctrine. It teaches that the sacraments are means of grace; to the others they are mere symbols and memorials. Churches with a catechism believe in indoctrinating, i. e. that there are certain things a church must believe in and stand for; churches without a catechism are like the rudderless vessel tossed by the turbulent sea.

If we change our paragraph in the manner suggested we shall soon need a new catechism or else will have to tone down some of its statements and of our beliefs in order to adjust ourselves to those reared in other environments.

Now it is true enough that many of us are not satisfied with the catechism and the ordinary way of catechism instruction. They contend that what the children need is not doctrinal teaching but religious training; they need spiritual experience and guidance as to how they can take their place in the congregation's worship and activities. We are heartily in accord with that view. Even in Germany we find that same movement. Only lately we discussed a new handbook which has that practical aim rather than mere drilling in the catechism. (Seim, Ev. Gem. leben) But the author of it gives the essential doctrines of the creed its place.

So, on the whole, we are of the opinion that it would be wise to go slowly. No one and nothing hinders us to build into our churches suitable material wherever found; we don't need a new confessional paragraph to do this.

One more feature to which the discussion about the paragraph led we want to make mention of before closing. It was pointed out that our paragraph, while declaring our faith in the Old and New Testaments, does not contain a positive statement of what our belief is. This was surprising to some, and a motion was made and adopted, that a committee of nine be appointed which is to submit a brief statement of our faith to next year's district conferences.

"SAVING THE CITY"

The other night I attended a special service arranged for by the Baptist Association of this city, for the purpose of raising funds for home mission work here in Cleveland. I want to report on this meeting for two reasons: 1) to introduce to our readers the speaker of the evening, Geo. W. Truett, minister of the First Baptist Church of Dallas, Texas, and 2) to give an idea of how the Baptists raise funds for missionary causes.

My assumption that our ministers will be glad to get acquainted with this particular clergyman is based on the fact that he was voted one of the "25 leading ministers of the country," in the poll of the "Christian Century," three years ago. *Dr. Geo. W. Truett* is a man of about 55 years and has been pastor of his present church for 31 years. I did not notice anything particularly striking about his personality. He was introduced as "one of the most noted speakers of the world and as a prophet of God." This rather broad statement he seemed to take meekly, perhaps as one of the conventional exaggerations of introduction speeches. He began in a low, conversational tone, but after a while he warmed up and developed a good deal of vehemence. The large audience—about 2000 people—and the sound of his own voice had their psychological effect on him. He gathered too much momentum and was unable to check himself. It was not so much a question of too much speed, but he began to declaim; and from now on he could not modulate his voice sufficiently to relieve the tension and make attention easier by a change of tone. It would be ungracious to judge of a speaker's ability by one address. Still this writer, acknowledging elements of strength in Truett's way of presenting things, felt that he was not living up to his reputation. Only once when he told a very touching story, did I notice in myself a certain melting of soul.

That does not mean, however, that there were not a good many strong points in the speech. American fashion, Dr. Truett chose for his subject a rather pretentious title. His subject was, *Saving the City;* not raising money for starting mission churches. To save the city, he said, is the great problem before the church today for the city is the nerve center as well as the storm center. And just as the soul in man is greater than the body, just so is it more important for the city to have a soul and save it, than the advancement of industry. Spiritual things are always higher than material. Tennyson, he claimed, when he wrote his "Crossing the Bar" did more for civilization than if he had built a thousand ocean liners. The highest spiritual values are religious values. Faith in God, in Christ, is a creative power. Every great believer

is a great doer. Faith is valuable if, and when, it lifts, enriches, sweetens, betters life. To follow Jesus means magnitude of soul; it gives vision, broadens horizons, creates ideals, bestows life.

The way to test a man is to ask him, what is your conception of life? To many it consists in material or even intellectual possessions. There he told a story of a miser who had lived on charity and who was later discovered to have left 3 millions of dollars. I thought the speaker was laying it on a little thick right there.

Then he presented the other extreme of men prodigals in the spending of money and life itself. Another story followed of a man who had invited his friends to give them a sensation. He jumped from a bridge into the swirling waters below: the suicide was the sensation.

Rather strong stuff, I thought again. Why select such extraordinary cases? The right conception of life is that of trusteeship, continued the speaker. I owe myself, my life to God, to humanity. Like Paul I ought to feel a debtor to the world. Another gruesome story was told, of a man who had lived to himself, amassed millions, and on his deathbed moaned: "It has come at last, I am broke and far from home!" And although his family showed him that his money and securities were all there, he kept repeating that heart-rending cry; and so he passed out.

Very sad, indeed, but overdone again, I felt. Now the speaker turned to the immediate task before him. Our time, he said, is one of momentous changes. Distance is wiped out. The world is becoming one big whispering gallery (He told us here that one wrote him from London, England, that he had heard his, Truett's sermon, over the radio, as plainly as though he had sat in one of Truett's front pews). And physical unity spells also spiritual unity. Such days as these call for big men. Woe to the city, and country, whose leaders are small men! We need the same devotion we showed during the last war. Then he rehearsed some of the scenes of that stirring time, which showed, incidentally, that his war idealism had not been affected by post-war developments and literature. Some have said, he went on, Christianity failed in the war. No, he replied, diplomacy failed, big business failed, education failed in the war; the only thing that did not fail was Christianity. It is for us, therefore, to use the gospel of Christ for the saving of the city, and for the Baptists of Cleveland, in particular, to rise to their opportunity and subscribe the $400,000 needed in the present campaign.

He told one of his campaign experiences, where a young couple had given their new little home for the purpose of liquidating the debt on the church. When he told that, the melting we spoke of

before took place. But not only in the writer's heart, but in the whole audience. And not only there; no, the speaker told us that the spirit of Christ and his cross (i e. of sacrifice) was so powerfully present in that audience in Texas that great numbers were pricked in their hearts and asked that old question, what must I do to be saved?

The reader of these lines may feel as though the writer had been amused by Truett's address rather than stirred and edified. That is not so, though. It is true, however, that his stories would not go so well with our people. I don't think they are quite as emotional as that Baptist audience. They like stories, but stories that sound as though they might have happened, not fairy tales or stories that happen only once in a million times.

Nevertheless our Mission Boards, or Boards of Promotion, or any other Board that desires to raise funds, might learn from these Baptists. We see when they wanted money for new churches, for pastor's salaries and for facilities, they sent for one of their big men, who was a specialist in money-raising. And he put his particular task within a large setting. He said we want to save this city, i. e., we want to do our share in saving it. And then he went about and raised the money himself. At the end of the one day those Baptists had between 150-200,000 dollars, almost 50 percent of the amount to be obtained.

We haven't many men who could do that. But we would have more if we could find it in us to give outstanding men their due need of praise. The Baptists—and others—believe in the *mutual admiration principle.* They speak well of one another. They go to excess in it, perhaps, but they get results. We are always afraid to make our men vain. Our parishioners, too, are of the same type. They seldom tell us that our sermons helped them. That is good in one way: we are saved from the temptations of fishing for compliments. It is bad, however, in another way: we don't get encouragement.

Still our Boards might say we don't believe in these high-power methods. In that case nothing is left for us to do but to try the way of well planned, persistently carried-out and ultimately successful education.

Zur „Captatio Benevolentiae."

Als die Zeitschriftenbehörde vor einem Jahr beschloß, im „Magazin" dem Englischen die erste Stelle zu geben, war das Echo aus dem deutschen Lager kein erfreuliches. Alte, treue Leser fühlten sich tief gekränkt und schrieben uns und dem Verlag entrüstete Briefe. Es schien ihnen ein Zeichen von Undankbarkeit gegen diejenigen zu sein, die das „Magazin" in der Vergangenheit so treu

unterstützt hatten. Einer der Opponenten machte seinem Herzen in dieser Weise Luft: „Ich habe des „Magazin" (oder die „Theologische Zeitschrift") 38 Jahre gelesen, zwischen uns ist stets die beste Freundschaft gewesen, aber nun will ich es nicht mehr!" Wir haben damals zu unserm großen Leidwesen eine ziemlich erhebliche Anzahl von Lesern verloren.

Seitdem ist nun ein Jahr verflossen, und die Leser haben wahrnehmen können, daß der deutsche Teil, obwohl an die zweite Stelle zurück, doch durchaus nicht stiefmütterlich behandelt worden ist. Die Artikel von Professor Grützmacher sind regelmäßig erschienen. Dieselben sind unsers Erachtens allein den Preis des Blattes wert. Wer die Nummern sämtlich aufbewahrt, oder noch besser, wer sie sich einbinden läßt ($1.50 im Verlagshaus), hat eine kurzgefaßte Dogmatik positiver Observanz. Im neuen Jahr wird Herr Professor Grützmacher in sechs Nummern eine **Geschichte der verschiedenen deutschen theologischen Schulen seit Schleiermacher** geben. Was könnte interessanter und zeitgemäßer sein für den, der im Drang der Geschäfte und im Wechsel der Zeiten den Faden der Orientierung nicht aus der Hand lassen will!

Wer also jetzt dem Blatt den Rücken kehrt, der verliert in der Tat viel, von den andern deutschen Darbietungen des Jahres ganz zu geschweigen. Damit auch die uns zeitweilig untreu Gewordenen nicht ohne Kenntnis der Sachlage bleiben, lassen wir diese Nummer an die Adresse aller unsrer Pastoren ausgehen.

Und noch eins erwähnen wir, um die „benevolentia" unsrer deutschen Leser zu gewinnen und festzuhalten. Bei uns stellen die alten, deutschen Leser den theologisch konservativen Teil dar. Sie repräsentieren die Orthodoxie der Väter. Aus dem englischen, resp. amerikanischen Lager kommen — freilich meist auf dem Weg über Deutschland — die vorwärtsschreitenden, modernen Anregungen und Gedanken. Wir sagen kein Wort gegen den Fortschritt, gegen Weiterbildung und Modernisierung unsrer theologischen Anschauungen. Immerhin ist es heilsam, nötig, ja unerläßlich, daß das Element der Beharrung nicht fehle. Es gibt Dinge, die wir nicht aufgeben können, wie sehr wir auch begehren, mit Wissenschaft und Zeit Schritt zu halten. Hier kommt es uns zu statten, daß wir in unserm alten, deutschen Leserkreis das nötige Gegengewicht haben. Wir möchten sie um keinen Preis missen. Sie sollen treue Wächterdienste verrichten, so daß wir nicht Flittergold eintauschen für edles Metall, noch von unserm eigenen Streben erwarten, was nur Gottes Geist geben kann.

Um dessentwillen rufen wir allen Mitgliedern der „alten Garde" zu: Bleibt uns treu! und denen, die uns auf eine kleine Weile verlassen haben: Kommt wieder, wir bedürfen Eurer! Möge unser Ruf nicht ungehört verhallen.

The Christian World

The Lausanne Conference

The Living Church (Episcopal)

Milwaukee, Wis.

The Conference at Work

Combined Editorials by Frederic C. Morehouse, Editorial Delegate and Special Correspondence by C. H. Palmer

The designated speakers were so chosen as really to represent as many phases of Christianity as possible. If I add that not one of our American Church delegation was a designated speaker at any session during the Conference, I hasten to explain that it is probably because, having taken so prominent a part in the preliminary arrangements, our American Churchmen on the advance committees properly gave all the conspicuous places to others. And certainly Bishop Brent in his opening sermon and in his recognized preeminence everywhere, amply carried away honors for the American Church, and made his colleagues increasingly proud of him.

Still, this has had the result of presenting American Christianity entirely from the Protestant side, leaving Catholic factors in the Conference to be supplied wholly, on the Anglican side from England and her colonies, on the Orthodox side from Europe. This helps on the curious current opinion in England that the United States is a distinctly "Puritan" country.

Since the preamble alone was "adopted"—and that unanimously, including, I think, the entire Orthodox delegation—and the sectional reports were only "received" "for the consideration of our respective Churches," it follows that neither the conference nor the constituent "Churches" are committed to the letter of the reports themselves.

Many of us were amazed at the extent to which Protestants themselves desired to be ranged on the side of Catholic doctrine. Thus, in the debate on the report on the Sacraments, the text, tentatively accepted and before the Conference on final debate, contained the statement: "We believe that in the Holy Communion our Lord is present." A Congregational minister moved to prefix "especially" to "present." On a show of hands, all but seven in a house of more than a hundred voted for the amendment.

If the Orthodox felt that it would compromise them to recognize the actual fact that such-and-such opinions are held by sections of Christendom—it is not stated that they are held within the communion of the historic Church—they were bound to adopt the course they did. But I think the grave difficulty of a sparse or complete lack of understanding of the western languages used in the conference gave them a distorted idea of what the statements implied.

Yet when, last of all, the preamble was presented, and the conference was asked to "adopt"—not merely to "receive"—it, the whole delegation voted in the affirmative and several of them joined heartily in the applause at the unanimous vote. Yet the preamble itself contained the enacting clause by which the reports following were said to be "received."

It is the first time that East and non-Latin West have ever met together in this fraternal manner on such magnitude. It would be too much to expect entire understanding of each other at this stage. The Orthodox were justified in their attitude of extreme caution.

But their scholarly representatives, of whom there were about thirty, performed a very real service during every debate. They kept the conference from even the semblance of Pan-Protestantism. With Anglicans, with whom almost invariably they voted, they supplied much of the Catholic element that has been so largely manifest in the conference.

Not until within two hours of the closing day was there any semblance of real discord, when there was presented the sixth of the sectional reports, on the subject, The Unity of Christendom in Relation to Existing Churches. Written by the Archbishop of Upsala, it had already been presented in tentative form, had been radically criticized, and had been referred back to the drafting committee for further consideration. I think we all hoped and believed that it would come back to us in reasonably satisfactory form such that, with possibly a few amendments, it could be "received" as on a par with the other reports. Such had been the procedure with respect to each of them.

But when the revised text was in our hands, and the subject was immediately presented for consideration, we discovered that the general character of the language was very little changed. From beginning to end there was no intimation of the fact that "existing Churches" comprised anything whatever except the Protestant denominations. Every paragraph, every sentence, obviously contained that implication, though, of course, not directly expressed.

I think very many of us were in consternation. There was no time for mutual consultation. To "receive" the report as on a par with the others would be to interpret the whole conference and its pronouncements from the standpoint of Pan-Protestantism. It would have meant the failure of the hopes in which many of us went there.

It was moved that the report be "received for reference to the Continuation Committee" rather than on a par with the foregoing reports. One felt immediately the sense of hostility throughout the house. One recognized that Protestantism had set its heart on this acceptance of its sole position. A Chinese Congregationalist wildly asserted that he had only been able to vote for the other reports on the expectation that this one would be adopted and wished to change his vote to the negative on all that had gone before. Nothing could conceal the immediate feeling of rage toward the introducer of the resolution; and some of the Anglican delegates were foremost among these Protestant stalwarts.

It was an unhappy incident. But the report so obviously presented *only* the Protestant position, without even expressing the feeling after a larger Catholicity that so many of the best on the Protestant side have continuously shown, that I wonder that its author, or anybody else, could seriously have supposed that it could secure the necessary unanimous acceptance in a body in which Anglo-Catholics are by no means a negligible factor either in quantity or in ability. And it hurt me that Protestants *wanted* this one-sided action after we had been in such close fraternal relations for three whole weeks and had learned to have so high a regard for one another. Also I would have supposed that all the Anglican representatives would have rallied unanimously in vindication of what I supposed was the commonly accepted Anglican position as compared with that of Protestantism. They did not.

At any rate the Anglican representatives were divided. Some sympathized with the Pan-Protestant report, some did not. The Protestant element under the leadership of the Archbishop of Upsala created this condition themselves, without the slightest necessity. From every point of view their document was not fit to stand on a par with the other sectional reports. At best it was petty, inadequate, affording no assistance to the solution of its difficult problem. It was nineteenth century Protestantism injected into the twentieth century.

We have learned much from one another. Protestantism itself, in the persons of its strongest men, craves, earnestly craves, something spiritual from Catholicity. We are in a transition stage. The Holy Spirit is transforming our minds more rapidly than we have supposed. We are getting into the *will to unity.* And that is a long step.

This, practically, is what the composite mind has registered:

A Church that is greater than the churches, one, holy, catholic, and apostolic. To most of the delegates, that Church appears to be the sum total of the churches; and the churches remain autonomous factors, the whole (and possibly each) accepting the faith expressed in the Apostles' and the Nicene Creeds, and each accepting the sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Communion in some form; all granting that in the latter there is a Presence of Christ, most of them holding that it is a "special" or a "real" Presence, both these terms having been accepted by an overwhelming majority of votes but failing for lack of absolute unanimity. All grant that there must be in all these churches a ministry that is accredited by all. Beyond that are, for the most part, reservations as to the separate positions of the different factors represented; and nowhere is this conception definitely stated. I am not using the actual terms of the reports. I am trying to express what seems to be the general mind rather than the written language. The final report, in which relations between the churches were stated in a pan-Protestant form, not receiving unanimous assent, was not sent forth with the others, but obviously expressed the very general sentiment, and not a few of the Anglican delegates seemed willing to accept it.

When a ministry accredited by all was affirmed as necessary to unity in this united Church, it was slearly understood that episcopal, presbyteral, and congregational factors must be correlated. No attempt was made to correlate them or to go further than the expression of the principle.

That means than an episcopate would everywhere be accepted; but what should be its function was not discussed. Neither was there any attempt to deal with the Papacy.

That bishops should ordain, or should act with others in ordaining, was, I think, commonly understood, though it was not directly expressed. But no one inquired what a bishop was to ordain. I do not think the term *priest* was once used in debate, neither can I discover that in the minds of the delegates there was the desire that bishops should ordain priests.

But—given valid bishops in this far-away united Church—what reason have we to believe that their ordinations would constitute priests in any Catholic sense? There would be no continuity of intention, as in the Anglican Churches, and, apparently, no current intention. No definite form of ordination was discussed. Bishops might conceivably ordain ministers; but that these would or could be priests, in the absence of any corporate or continuing intention of the Church, as well, generally, as of any individual intention, is not clear. The presumption would seem to be otherwise.

I think this bears out the contention that *The Living Church* has more than once made that, in formulating the terms of the Quadrilateral in 1886, it was a grave error to speak of the historic episcopate rather than of the historic ministry of bishops, priests, and deacons.

As far as I can see, we must now begin anew to propose to the Christian world the necessity of accepting the historic priesthood, which would probably have been accepted by this time along with the episcopate if we had propounded the whole threefold historic ministry to them at the time when we dislocated the latter by urging upon them the episcopate alone. For my part I cannot see that the acceptance of the historic episcopate divorced from the historic priesthood is of much value in paving the way for unity.

But Lausanne has not so much as heard whether there be an historic priesthood.

Two sacraments have been accepted, each with a very incomplete and deficient statement of its functions and purport. I want to say frankly that I was surprised at the degree of high sacramental appreciation that was expressed by many on the Protestant side. There are Presbyterians and Congregationalists who will go much beyond our Low Churchmen in their sacramental language.

But of the "five commonly called sacraments," apart from the reservation that there are those who accept seven sacraments, and apart from the statements in regard to the ministry, nothing was said. Can we, then, conceive of a huge section of a united Church that does not accept or administer Confirmation? There never has been an accepted

part of the Catholic Church, east or west, that did not accept and practice Confirmation, either at the hands of a bishop or with the anointing oil that had been consecrated by a bishop. If the historic episcopate should be introduced into this united Church, there is nothing to indicate that the children would be brought to the bishop to be confirmed by him, nor that Confirmation would be made the normal preparation for the Holy Communion. Can we contemplate a vast section of the Catholic Church in which there would be this variation from the historic practice?

And that I am frankly anxious over the fact that these really advanced representatives of the Protestant Churches of America and Europe do not appreciate any necessity for entering into vital relationship with the historic Catholic Church. Most of them hold that in the formation of their respective Churches there was no break from that Church. Lutherans, Presbyterians, and Congregationalists avowed this principle.

To hold that all baptized persons are *ipso facto* members of this Catholic Church is one thing; to hold that voluntary organizations that these have formed are corporate sections of that Church is quite another. Moreover some of these Churches (in the modern sense) have many members that are not baptized, and some of them actually refuse baptism to children. Where, then, is the principle that baptism is an act of admission to the Church, even if it followed that baptized members were free to form voluntary organizations of their own and to reckon these as Churches, free from any obligation to recognize the binding authority of the whole?

Two totally different conceptions were manifest in this conference. One group was striving to find a way to bring back into corporate relationship with the old-time Church the other group, which, in the conception of the former, was, *as organizations*, now unrelated to it. The second group was consciously seeking nothing of the kind, but rather a basis for bringing existing organizations into a measure of unity with each other, so that there might be common action and intercommunion between them all. One conceives of an urgent need for corporate unity, the other contemplates a federal unity. Can these two conceptions be correlated? Perhaps, ultimately; but not until they are frankly faced as difficulties, as they were not at Lausanne. The overwhelming majority not only held tenaciously to the latter view but resented the suggestion of the former.

Why should not Protestant Christianity be definitely encouraged to seek its own kind of unity, leaving Anglicans and Easterns entirely out? In my judgment we only embarrass them, especially when we do not definitely assert what are the differences that stand between us, but minimize them, as invariably we do.

It would be an immense gain in Christendom if the definitely Protestant world would form a single organization, based on their own tenets and formed according to their own conceptions. They do not want to be hampered by such ideas as creeds, historic ministries, bishops and priests. They have no interest in discussing the nature

either of episcopate or priesthood, of Confirmation, of sacramental grace. The issues in which they are interested are quite other than these.

At Lausanne they went (from their point of view) a long way to meet what they conceive to be our views, as steps toward unity. But they do not appreciate *why* we are so insistent on "our own way" nor what a long, long way from corporate reunion we are still left after all this splendid fraternization.

Our exclusion from such a "united Church" ought to be entirely compatible with the most friendly feeling toward it. And if our own Protestant section should make strong efforts to commit the Anglican Churches to this basis of pan-Protestant unity—I am not sure that it would if the issue were properly drawn—then we can only say that our Anglican Armageddon would have arrived and leave the outcome in the hands of the Holy Spirit.

We ought to face facts. If, by insisting on the only sort of unity in which we could participate, we are perpetuating the hundreds of sects into which Protestantism is divided, beyond the period in which Protestantism itself could unite them or many of them, are we helping or hampering the work of unity?

Eventually, we believe that Catholic unity will some, simply because we believe it to be the will of God that it should come. The *will to be merged* must probably be a preliminary condition. In the meantime a united Protestantism in place of a disunited, chaotic Protestantism would be a real step forward.

After all, truth will ultimately prevail, and it will be the Holy Spirit, rather than any human logic, that will eventually point the way to truth and unity, without sacrificing either one in the supposed interest of the other.—*Sept.* 3, 10, 17, '27.

German Lutheran's Views

C. H. Palmer, London

General Superintendent Zoellner was one of the German Lutheran delegates. It will be remembered that he made an exceedingly beautiful remark about the Creeds, "The Apostles' Creed is the folk-song of the people of God, the Nicene Creed is the expression of the conscious art of the theologians." In a Lutheran paper published at Berlin, *Das Evangelische Deutschland*, he has written some of his impressions about the conference. Critics doubted whether it would be possible to settle the question at such a large gathering. Many newspaper articles in Germany expressed the view that the simplest way to agree would be, let each have his own method of expression, forms, beliefs, and then each can love, respect, and unite with each other. If this view had won at Lausanne the whole Church would have been plunged into disaster. And on this point came in the legend from the English side: "We are first concerned not with reunion, but with truth."

A second danger was the adoption of formulae for unity, but which in reality had no meaning. They might have devised phrases for the

sake of compromise, and let each man interpret them as he would. That such unity would be false is quite obvious. It is naturally not easy for Americans coming from the New World without much history behind them to understand all the divisions which exist in the Old World. But the president of the congress, Bishop Brent, was careful to avoid this.

If it be asked what the congress did, it may be replied, at least it made a beginning. There was a burning desire to atone for the sins of the past. It is something accomplished when before the minds of Christians the *una sancta ecclesia* stands out as an ideal. The needs of the missionary world were especially felt. In a sermon which Pastor Keller preached at the German church in Lausanne during the congress, he asked, "What did all these persons assembled together really desire?" He gave as the answer: "They seek a Church." I think this answer was right. We value highly what we have got, but we also see what we lack.

It will be noticed that the learned and devout Lutheran takes the side of Bishop Temple and is against Dr. Parkes Cadman. He wants a Church, not a vague mixture of belief "to harmonize with a democratic age." This is a remarkable testimony coming from a Lutheran, and it shows there is in the Lutheran body today an aspiration to something more definite in the way of a Church.—*Oct.* 1, '27.

The Freedom of the Free Churches

What Do They Stand For? Are They Still Needed?

The Christian Union Quarterly, Baltimore, July, 1927

Extracts from Article by Dr. W. B. Selbie

Recent discussions on reunion, and certain events like the passing of the Enabling Act in the Anglican Church and the Disestablishment of the Church in Wales, have raised once more the question, What do the Free Churches stand for, and are they still needed. It may be frankly admitted that time and the grace of God have done much to diminish the need for their original witness. The claim of the State to exercise authority over the Church is by no means what it was in the reign of Elizabeth or even of Anne. Congregationalists have no longer any monoply in the belief in "gathered" churches and in the spiritual autonomy of God's people, nor are Methodists distinguished above all others for evangelistic zeal. The fact that those principles for which the first Nonconformists stood and suffered have now been almost universally recognized and accepted is certainly something to be thankful for. But it does not, for one moment, justify the assumption that these principles are now obsolete and may be disregarded. That such an assumption is often unconsciously entertained makes it all the more necessary that the Free Churches should know where they are and should look unto "the hole of the pit whence they were digged." They need today a new emphasis and a new perspective, but they need even more that living faith in the freedom of the gospel which characterized their fathers and the courage to reassert it fearlessly under the needs and conditions of the present time.

The so-called "Catholic" reaction, in the midst of which we find ourselves, is a direct challenge to all that we Free Churchmen stand for and count precious. We cannot meet it by mere negations, but only by a positive reassertion, both in theory and practice, of those spiritual values which we have inherited and which alone constitute our *raison d'etre.*

The first thing we have to do is to be sure that we really believe in the liberty wherein we stand and are prepared to take the consequences of it. Our churches, as a rule, show themselves tolerably independent of outside authority. They recognize the force of tradition, public opinion, and the like, but in no case would they be willing blindly to obey them. They are always jealous for the crown rights of Jesus Christ. They recognize Him as the sole Head of the Church, and in the gift of the Holy Spirit they find the power that animates, sustains, and guides them. What they need, however, is to live up to the full measure of their belief. They are far too prone to follow traditional lines both in thought and action merely because they are traditional. Many of the older folk among them seem content to take "safety first" for their motto, and fear to launch out into new ways or risk any adventurous action. In spite of their boasted freedom they are often as hidebound and conservative as those churches which have none of their advantages. The stiffness and conventionality of the forms of worship in many Free Churches are a real hindrance to progress, and suggest to the outsider an air of unreality which is not attractive. Our freedom in this respect is at least as much of a responsibility as a privilege. We depend not on stately ritual or time-honored forms, but on the living presence and inspiration of the Spirit of God. Where this is not consciously realized both by minister and people, prayer and praise become jejune and meaningless, and worship loses all its power and savour. On the other hand, nothing could be more helpful and beautiful than the spontaneous outpouring of man's gratitude and need in the presence of God and the living communion with Him which such worship involves. The Free Churches have an unexampled opportunity of making the public worship of the sanctuary a thing so real and vital that men and women will not need to be drawn to it more or less reluctantly, but will gladly welcome it as an indispensable means of grace and life. To this end they will need to cultivate reality and adaptability above all other things.

The same is true with regard to the general work of the churches. It is an astonishing fact that there are ministers and church members who are opposed to modern methods of Sunday-school teaching and administration, and that simply on the ground that they are a departure from use and precedent. Unless they are prepared to make some radical new departures and to use to the full their liberty in this direction, they may as well recognize that "their doom is writ."

And what are we to say of our theological freedom? Here again, our churches are in grave danger of being entangled in a yoke of bondage. While they pay lip service to liberty, they are apt to be

very suspicious of freedom of thought in the pulpit. It is hardly yet realized that the restatement of Christian doctrine in modern terms is a matter of life and death for our churches. Many young ministers who are thoroughly evangelical in spirit find their work hampered and their motives suspected by those who cannot tolerate any departure from time-honored forms and phrases. It is to be feared that some of our congregations do not want to be taught, and are hardly aware that they have anything to learn. They shrink from untried ways and ideas as from something dangerous. They like their ministers to play for safety by the soothing repetition of what they have heard a thousand times before. The result is that young people with alert and inquiring minds can hardly escape the feeling that the pulpit does not always tell them all the truth, and so are still further estranged, not merely from the Church, but from all that the Church stands for. One can understand a situation like this in churches which are creed-bound and dogma-ridden. But it ought not to be possible with us. We believe in the guidance of the Spirit of God who will lead us into all the truth. We also believe that God has yet more light and truth to break forth from his Word, and we ought to hold ourselves free to receive the new light and pass it on to others.

For it must always be remembered that it is essential to our Free Church position to find our only authority in God Himself through his Holy Spirit. Scriptures, creeds, councils, traditions, and organizations are all fallible and temporary. They have their uses and are invaluable in their place. But they cannot bind either the hearts or consciences of men. That we are made for God, and restless until we find Him, is evidenced by the fact that in the long last we will obey what we believe to be the will of God at all costs and before all others. Free Churchmen are not masterless men, nor do they indulge in license under the cloak of liberty. But they bring all authorities to the test of the will and truth of God as revealed in Jesus Christ, and as confirmed in Christian experience. They put religion before churches and faith before doctrines, and they hold themselves free to follow new ways both of thought and action at the bidding of the living word of God. This freedom they regard as a priceless heritage from the past, and their whole future depends on the extent to which they honor and maintain it.

Are the Creeds "Outworn Categories"?

The Lutheran, Philadelphia, August 25th, 1927

Editorial

This is a question that needs a decisive answer. Nearly every book we read that deals with questions of faith (excepting those that be issued from the Lutheran, Presbyterian and parts of the Reformed press) speaks in condemnation of the creeds, from the Apostles' Creed all the way down to the Westminster Catechism. It would be easy to fill a book with quotations from so-called "Modernists," and even "Fundamentalists," that make creeds and doctrine synonymous with

a non-progressive and defunct Christianity. They are made responsible for the existing sectarianism and are denounced in many quarters as obstacles in the way of Christian unity. That surely is not the case in the Roman Catholic Church. The real cause for a disunited Protestantism must be sought for elsewhere. It is the roving, rambling, latitudinarian, anti-doctrinal spirit that creates ten or more divisions where the creedal spirit creates one.

Why Call Creeds "Outworn Categories"?

Let us look at the term from the point of view of the Modernist, who is responsible for it. He does not deny that the great creeds of Christendom embody in their formulas the essential truths of Christianity. He simply denies that they can speak with authority in the present age because they were born at crisis when Christian life and thought wore a complexion different from that of the present day. Truth in the fourth or the sixteenth century took on forms and concepts that are strange and foreign to us now. The Church that fails to take account of this may have a substantially correct theology, but not in a form suited to the age. The creedal categories are not necessarily untrue, but they are "outworn."

To appreciate the viewpoint of these Modernists, who are not ready to cast overboard the essential truths of the creeds, we reread the Formula of Concord, which, after a series of controversies that disturbed the peace of the Lutheran Church for a generation, became the restorer of harmony. It was not difficult to understand how, apart from a knowledge of their historic background, a stranger would come to the conclusion that its categories are surely outworn. Zeal for a clear and definite expression of faith was then the great concern of earnest students of the Scriptures. They were men of faith, and the Scriptures were to them the sole and final authority, as they are not now. But great changes have taken place in Protestantism since the year 1580, when doctrinal unity in the Lutheran Church was restored. The "categories" of the Formula of Concord would hardl yappeal to Modernists, who are more profoundly interested in adjusting Christian faith to modern thought and life than in making it square with the Scriptures.

Old Heresies in New Form

And yet every one of the disputed questions which the Formula of Concord settled are in evidence today, as they were then. The seven controversies after Luther's death revolved around errors that are now even more dangerous and far more insidious now than they were then. Poor, compromising Melanchthon and his followers came near allowing the yoke of Roman Catholic jurisdiction to be placed upon the neck of the Lutheran Church. Hence the "Leipsiz Interim" controversy. It would be easy to name quite a few tendencies in Protestantism that bear the earmarks of Roman Catholicism.

Then came what was known as the *Majoristic* controversy, which raged around the question of the relation of good works to man's

salvation. Major maintained that they were necessary to salvation, and Amsdorf in his zeal to defend the scriptural doctrine of salvation by faith alone went so far as to say that good works might tempt men to ground their salvation upon them rather than upon free grace and thus prove detrimental to salvation. The Formula came to the rescue and made plain that good works are the fruit of saving faith and its evidence, and hence are not a ground of justification before God. Read much of the Christian literature of today and see how it is shot through with the Roman Catholic teaching and practice of good works.

Then came the *Antinomian* controversy, which involved the relation of the law and the Gospel. If there is a finer setting forth of the correct scriptural relation between the two and the function of each than is found in the formula, it would be interesting to know where it is. There is much Christianity today that smacks more of law than of gospel.

Then came the *Osiandrian* controversy, which swung around the great central doctrine of jurisdiction. Osiander and his party claimed that Christ's righteousness through justification was infused and not imputed, as the formula makes clear. It would be interesting to make a study of the confused ideas that many Christians have concerning the relation of justification to sanctification.

Another important issue was raised by what is known as the *Synergistic* controversy, which swung around the question as to what part the sinner had to perform in effecting his own salvation or conversion. The formula made clear that the sinner's transformation is through the power of the Gospel alone. What we sing in the hymn, "Rock of Ages," is the faith which the formula sets forth. Who does not know the many varieties of Synergism in modern Christian thought? Our religious literature is full of the idea that man can take hold of his boot straps and lift himself up into favor with God without much, if any, help from above.

The *Flacian* controversy had to do with original sin, Flacius contending that sin inhered in human nature as part of its very substance. The formula makes clear that originial sin is not a physical defect but simply moral depravity. Today the very thought of original sin is repellant to many people who insist that all that is needed is to make them conscious of it. Sin is no longer guilt demanding retribution.

What is known as the *Crypto-Calvinistic* controversy had to do with the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. In endeavoring to defend the real presence in the sacrament, much logic was used that sounds strange to modern ears. Even Lutherans would hardly care to reason about that mystery as the theologians did in that day. Their categories would seem much outworn. But necessity to define was upon them, and the formula rescued the situation by statements that will always be repellant to those who explain away the words of both Christ and the apostle Paul and make the sacrament at best a mere memorial.

All the errors above mentioned appear in new and varied forms and must be countered in a way and manner that will fit the peculiar trends of thought and life which make the present age so radically different from, and yet so essentially the same as, the sixteenth century. The Lutheran Church will do well to take into account this changed and perplexing situation and to proclaim its faith in a manner and language which will appeal to the modern mind.

The Fewness of Our Converts

Thomas F. Coakley, D.D.

The "Official Catholic Directory" for 1927 presents some interesting figures relative to the propagation of the Faith in this country. For the first time we find in the consolidated summary of statistics a separate column for converts. Not all the dioceses make reports of converts, but from those for which figures are available, I have picked out the four archdioceses and five dioceses in the Eastern half of the United States whose figures are the highest. The data in detail follows:

	No. of Priests	No. of Converts	Av. per Priest
Baltimore	571	1860	3.2
Boston	987	1130	1.1
Philadelphia	955	1529	1.6
Cincinnati	454	830	1.8
Brooklyn	656	1611	2.4
Detroit	557	2120	4.
Cleveland	452	873	1.9
Pittsburgh	665	835	1.2
Newark	710	920	1.3
Total	6007	11708	1.9
Grand Total for U. S.	24,990	35751	1.4

These figures show that the average number of converts made by each priest in the United States is 1.4 per year.

With 25,000 priests in the United States and with 90,000,000 non-Catholics to bring into the fold, some mathematician with a fondness for differential calculus might tell us how long it is going to take to preach the Gospel to the whole of America. Of a truth the Faith is not making tremendous headway among us if the figures quoted in the "Catholic Directory" are to be relied upon.

As a matter of fact, it is well known that priests are not responsible for all converts. Many of them are the result of mixed marriages; not a few are the result of the instruction in Christian Doctrine which as a rule precedes mixed marriages in many dioceses. A respectable percentage of converts is the happy consequence of illness in Catholic hospitals; while perhaps the minority are due to private reading and study or the influence of Catholic friends and associates.

Book Review

(When ordering books, please mention this Magzaine.)
NOTE—Reviews, when not signed, are by the Editor.

The Book Nobody Knows, *by Bruce Barton.* The Bobbs Merrill Co., Indianapolis, 1926. 306 pages, $2.50.

Last year we discussed Barton's first book—which proved a "best seller" of the season—"The Man Nobody Knows." In it he sought to explain the success of Jesus' life, not on supernatural, but on natural grounds. Jesus' life is the *greatest achievement story* that manykind knows. The secret lay in his magnetic personality. He appealed to men because of his strong manliness, his buoyant optimism, his sociable nature. He had great executive talent, knew how to pick and develop men. As the one who fully realized the principle of service in his life, he is the founder of modern business. And he not only believed in these principles himself, he got others to believe in them for he was the greatest advertizer that ever lived. Barton wrote his life of Jesus for business men, and the business men liked it and bought it. To us it seemed unsatisfactory for Jesus was more than a genius, he was divine; and if Paul was right in seeing in the cross the quintessence of the Christian faith, Barton is wrong.

Owing to our disagreement with him on the first book, we approached this second with some prejudice; but we are happy to say, after going through it, that we rather like it. It is in Barton's unconventional style, sparkling with apt remark and amusing anecdote. It is written for the ordinary reader; still, even the minister may learn much from it.

He says, the bible gives a bird's-eye view of the development of civilization, a sort of "Outline of History"; and then he takes up the bible story from Genesis to David, illuminating his review with interesting comment. Thereupon he goes on to enlarge on the literary excellence of the bible. Here you find "the greatest of all poems, one of the greatest dramas, one of the finest love-stories and a collection of proverbs which in varying phraseology have entered into the common-sense philosophy of nearly every modern nation."

He gives selections from the psalms and the wisdom literature (ascribed to Solomon), and readings from the prophets of Israel down to the exile, bringing the personalities of these preachers of righteousness and hope into strong relief. The Old Testament, he says is the record of God's progressive revelations of himself to men. A God who had to be persuaded by argument and sacrifice—this was the God of Abraham, of Isaac and of Jacob. But when we come to Amos we hear: "God cares nothing about sacrifice; He is a God of justice." Yes,

adds Hosea, and a God of kindness. And finally, in Jonah the most compassionate note is struck: Jehovah is the God of Nineveh as well as of Jerusalem, his love reaches to the end of the earth. The four gospels give us the story of "the great life." Theologians have engaged in a good deal of doctrinal controversy about the person of Jesus, about the Virgin Birth, his miracles, the atonement, and so forth. Jesus seems to have thought little of these questions. At any rate, he was much more tolerant towards heretical opinions than any of his followers. "His was the broadest sort of invitation to fellowship, having no petty barriers of creed or formulae or ceremony. "He went about doing good." "Never man so spake." These—his good works and his good words—are the things for which he wished to be remembered; they constitute the story of his life." Barton has told us in his first book why he considers Jesus' life the "greatest achievement story" ever written. In this second book there is no reiteration of the same arguments. He simply tells the story of those three years in brief outline. It is the story that changed the whole world, he says; but that it changed the world by the reconciliation and redemption wrought in and by Christ Jesus, Barton does not say.

Then follow "the Acts and the Epistles." "The shadow of the cross extended so rapidly that in less than a single century it falls across the emperor's throne." Barton traces the dramatic steps by which this incredible success was won. He does it in vivid strokes, interspersing much interesting detail from contemporary sources (e. g. Pliny's famous letter to emperor Trajan, written about 40 years after Paul's death). The apostle Paul is the most successful promotional agent of the gospel, the greatest church builder, and perhaps the finest Christian character of the ages. He is also the representative Liberal of early Christianity. He won against the Fundamentalists of his time in the first Church Convention, held at Jerusalem (Acts 15). His letter to the Galatians is the "Magna Charta of Christian liberty. It is the rebuke of bigotry and the battle cry of freedom." Paul stood his ground against hard-shell theology and strict constructionists from Judaea.

Barton seems to have prized the letter to the Galatians almost as highly as did Martin Luther. But to Barton, Paul is fighting for intellectual freedom, to Luther he is fighting for free grace and redemption by faith only.

The letters of the New Testament are discussed in Barton's best style. In Corinth the New Testament began to be written. From here Paul sends out the two letters to the Thessalonians. To get a taste of how Barton puts us in touch with the situation of writer and recipients, one must read his comment on first and second Thessalonians. He has a striking gift for touching up the dimmed colors of the background, thus shedding fresh light on the picture.

At times the play of his imagination produces results more amusing than convincing. For instance, he says, in prison at Rome, Paul was having rather a good time. He lived in his own hired house, entertaining lavishly. The five years there must have cost him thirty

thousand dollars (according to an eminent scholar), six thousand dollars a year for rent in Rome, where rents were high, and for food for his large household, and for transportation for himself and his companions. We don't know where the money came from, but never has the world spent 30,000 dollars to better purpose.

In chapters 5 and 6 the author presents "ten great men" and "ten famous women" of the bible. Then he has a very interesting chapter on, how did we get the Bible? A surgeon of national reputation asked him, in his book, to give an answer to two questions:

1. How were the books of the Bible gathered into a collection? Who selected them and how do we know that the right ones were selected?

2. By what means were these chosen books preserved and handed down?

The answer to the first question is: the books of the Old Testament which were most used and gave most inspiration survived. It is a case of survival of the fittest. The books of the New Testament were also selected by the process of use. The first books were apostolic letters, those of Paul and the larger letters of Peter, John and James. When the gospel appeared they were at once used in like fashion, because they were so important and so interesting. There was immediate agreement on the chief books, the 4 gospels and the larger epistles. Gradually there came to be agreement on all, not by authority but by the test of general usage; and the translations, and later the printing of the bible, finally fixed the list.

The answer to the second question is, they were preserved before the art of printing, in manuscripts, in whose composition extreme care was used. The earliest manuscript copies date from the 4th century. Barton here tells the story of Tischendorf's discovery of the "Sinaitic" in most interesting fashion. In 1844, at St. Catherine's monastery on the Sinaitic peninsula, Tischendorf rescued 47 leaves of one of the oldest manuscripts of the Septuagint from being used to kindle a fire in his room. In 1859 he returned to the monastery, now with the authority of the Czar of Russia, and, on his last evening there, the steward showed him a parcel wrapped in red cloth. Imagine his almost delirious joy when he saw, on untying it, not only the Septuagint, but the New Testament complete.

The other two old manuscripts of the bible are the Vatican at Rome and the Alexandrine in the British Museum.

Barton tells us, in the rest of the chapter, of the higher and lower critics and their work, and of the translations, especially of the bible into English, from Wiclif down to the American Standard Version of 1901, and the latest versions by Moffatt, Goodspeed, and the one by Ballantine (the Riverside Bible); giving the King James Version the palm for beauty but recognizing the value of the others for the purpose of comparison and for better understanding of the original. On the whole a chapter replete with useful information for every minister.

In the closing chapter on the "Influence of the Bible," its circu-

lation in the past and now, the testimonials of writers of every shade of belief and unbelief, and the attested fruits of its use in the most desperate cases makes an impressive argument.

Barton is not interested in theology, in metaphysics or in controversy. Beliefs and creeds are mere mental ballast to him. But these characteristics—or shall we call them limitations?—he shares with the age. He believes, however, that the bible as a literature, as a book of great biographies, above all of the life of Jesus, that the bible as the fountain head of moral and spiritual values, has enough human interest to insure it a high place in modern life, if presented with a modern appeal.

The title of his book was suggested to him by a reader of his first one. Barton, of course, never intended to intimate that he was the only one who knew the bible as it ought to be known. His idea was that most people thought the bible was a rather tiresome book, while in reality it is exceedingly interesting; that it was a book for the preacher and theologian, while it is a book for all the world; that it was a book of doctrines, while it is a book of the men of God; that it had only a remote connection with the problems of the daily life, while really it helps us to solve these very problems.

Along these lines Barton has labored with considerable zest and success. He may not have said all that would and should be said about it. However, if he has induced his readers only to step into the outer courts of the sanctuary, he will have rendered them a great service. And if in time they find their way into the inner shrine no one doubtless would be more rejoiced than the author.

The Appeal to Reality, by R. Edis. Fairbairn. The Abingdon Press, 1927. 192 p., $1.00.

The modern mind is bent on the quest for reality in all fields of human endeavor. Religion could not be expected to escape this general tendency, and religion can stand, and even welcomes, this test. In the domain of science the two Bacons were the fathers of the new method of observation and experimentation which have resulted in the wonderful discoveries and results in the exploration of nature. The application of the critical method to religion is of more recent date. To a great many faith and science have to do with different worlds, they are even said to be opposed to each other.

The writer rather thinks that they cannot be so divorced. If science teaches us to be loyal to the facts of the world around us so far as these facts are ascertainable by us, so the modern approach to religion—the new Realism, he calls it—is an attitude of utter loyalty to the facts given in the religious life. The "two piers on which the arch of the Christian faith rests" are the historic manifestations of God in Christ and individual spiritual experience. It is our task to present the facts of Christ's life and personality so intelligently that people are convinced by it and accept them. It may be impossible to furnish abso-

lutely compelling proof but, according to the writer, it ought to be possible to show that the weight of greater probability is in favor of the truth of the Christian claims.

Throughout the book the author pleads for an open mind for the attitude of modern scholarship. He accepts the gradualness of the religious insight in the biblical writers (the bible is a "religious literature rather than an authoritative divine dictation"). The person of Christ is the decisive factor; on metaphysical questions one may be satisfied to be a "cheerful agnostic." He deprecates the old forms of revivalism. Emotion is a by-product, intelligent conviction is the better thing. The "simple gospel," so often mistakenly stressed, the "finished work" of Christ, are in most cases an easy substitute of people lazy in thought and conduct for the full gospel of real consecration.

Of special interest were to us his reflections on the newer psychology. We agree with him that the live problem of today is that of the bearing of this psychology on religion. Is the subconscious a correcter term for what we have so far called the "soul"? Are Christian Science and New Thought and other schools of suggestion that achieve such remarkable results in soul culture and joy of life, legitimate competitors of Christianity? Can we say—with W. James—that God uses a variety of ways to secure a variety of religious experiences? Are the New Thought people really finding God, only under different names? The author does not answer these questions. He only makes up his mind to this, that "no life finds enrichment and enlargement by contact with inner realities without finding God." But we trust that he is not willing to give up his faith in the absoluteness of the Christian religion.

One regrettable slip of the writer's we cannot but mention. In the chapter, "Creating a Social Instinct," he uses the pre-war Germany as an example of the creation of a false instinct. We hear the old stories again of Nietzsche, the father of German imperialism, of Germany's "diabolical" scheme of world-exploitation; of the German manufacture of a diabolical "Kultur," etc. And this in 1927 We had supposed that all these atrocity stories of Allied Propaganda had been definitely buried, and that after Professor Barnes, and others, the light had broken through somewhat. But we see the old mythologies (Barnes) die hard, and some have a definitely closed mind. Still a man who is after reality and loyalty to facts ought to be able to see in 1927 what he could not see in 1917.

With this exception, we have derived a good deal of inspiration from the book. We do not always agree, but reaching out for reality is a laudable and necessary endeavor.

Purpose in Teaching Religion, by *George W. Fiske* (Professor of Religious Education Graduate School of Theology Oberlin College). The Abingdon Press, 1927. 244 pages, $1.75.

The teachers in our Sunday schools are in many cases very earnest, but what they lack is an intelligent understanding of the purpose of religious education and an acquaintance with the modern methods of teaching. This book is written to give information along both these lines.

The author has great faith in the power of teaching. Some people have claimed that religion must be caught, not taught. Our writer disagrees altogether with this assertion. He admits indeed that we cannot presume to control the presence or the cooperation of the Holy Spirit, and that we cannot guarantee the action of supernatural grace. We should not try to substitute educational mechanics for divine grace or spiritual power. Still we can teach "the infinite importance of this supernatural source of power, and the ways in which the human heart can be opened to God's spirit and can learn to cooperate with him in a vital partnership of life." The purpose of religious teaching is not, to instruct in doctrines (or the catechism), or knowledge of the Bible. Our modern curriculum is pupil-centered. Its aim is to teach the child or youth the Jesus-way of living; to start with the individual, inspiring him with the motives and ideals of Jesus; then to make him understand, and adopt, the aims represented in Jesus' conception of the Kingdom of God. The golden rule is to be applied to the business world, to politics, to international relations. A merely moral education is not enough. It must be undergirded by religious sanctions. Only the love of God will furnish sufficient spiritual and emotional power to solve the personal and collective problems of the age.

In the second part the author analyses the current methods in the light of the educational principles developed in the earlier chapters. He pleads for a graded curriculum (favoring the department unit); for a generous use of methods appealing to the imagination (films, dramatics, stories), and especially, for the modern "project teaching" of religion. This project method is useful because in it the pupil becomes active, not a passive listener or mere answerer only; the teaching subjects are acted out and therefore make a deeper impression on the scholar. This reviewer has no experience along this line, and the book does not show how particular projects might be carried out, so we must withhold our judgment on this interesting phase.

We have read the book with great interest. It imparts a great deal of information, is thoroughly up-to-date. It is evidently written by a man not only well acquainted with the theory but also the practice of modern religious education. If it was read by many teachers it would convince them of the necessity of a radical change in their teaching methods. It might cause many to drop out of the teacher ranks, and that would be a good riddance.

The Nest of Spears, by *F. W. Boreham.* The Abingdon Press, 1927. 284 pages, $1.75.

Boreham is a prolific writer. Every year another book of his is on the market. We had long decided to pass him up, but as we take up his latest volume, the twentieth by the way, we feel ourselves again getting under his spell. He likes to find his subjects among the common place things and experiences of life. Who, for instance, would think that a magpie could give inspiration to any one? And yet, here he has a chapter on "A. D.", the Artful Dodger, a magpie, which has a strange mania for collecting things simply to have them around, and goes on to speak of the human magpie, the boys and girls who gather things that are of no earthly use to them; the ladies, unmarried, that run from one fad to another, and the men who load their nests with scrip and deeds and stocks and shares that can never help them in the hour of real need; down to the royal magpie, emperor Caligula, who went North to conquer the Britons and, instead, collected pretty pebbles, starfish and seaweed and sailed for home.

Or take the next chapter, "the angel with the whip." There is a boy who likes the swish and crack of the whip he had lately received as a present, why, so muses our author, does the boy derive such strange, satisfaction from his whip? He discovers that the whip is the sign of authority. When man first tore off a soft, yielding branch from the willow tree and plucked off the leaves, lo and behold, he had a whip in his hand He was a king, he ruled. And then the whip became the instrument of authority. Even the angels use the whip to drive us to work and effort, and without its lashes frequently applied who would be a saint, or how could the work of the world be done?

So the author goes on through 40 chapters, apparently with perfect ease, still showing clearly the skill of the finished artist. His illustrations are often most helpful and he has a strange gift for opening the eyes to the deeper meanings of life's ordinary experiences. In a happy way he points out the spiritual law in the physical world.

The Truth and the Life and other Sermons, by Joseph Fort Newton, D.D., L.L.D. Geo. H. Doran Co. 1926. 340 pages.

Mr. Newton, whom some of us know from his occasional contributions to the "Christian Century," is listed among the "25 leading ministers" of the country (see March number of "Magazine," 1925, P.P. 138-139). He has occupied some of the most prominent pulpits in America, and in England. In this volume he gives us a collection of 24 sermons that are characteristic of his manner and spirit. They are the fruits of the years following the World War. "Such unity as they have is to be found in the faith which they seek to interpret and expound; a faith-finding its center and circumference in Christ, in whom the character of God, the meaning of life, and the prophecy of the soul become incandescent in a vision so ineffably lovely that the words of the

preacher are but stammering beggars about a throne. If no echo of the angry debates which have agitated the churches is heard in these sermons, it is because the preacher has no interest in such issues, deeming them in no wise relevant to the actual issues of our age."

Here we have his program and his theological position. We do not want dogma, he says, we want the living God. What we need is not more books of dogma but more Christ-like lives. The real Higher Criticism is not a question as to the Gospel of Luke or John, but the Gospel according to you and me. Our little lives are a part of the vast biography of Jesus. "Ye are letters of Christ, known and read of all men" (2 Cor. 3: 2-3). Of all truths none is more practical, none less metaphysical, than the truth of the incarnation—that is, the incarnation of Christ in us. Sir Philip Sidney describes what that truth means when it becomes real in actual life.

A sweet, attractive kind of grace;
The full assurance given by looks;
Perpetual comfort in a face;
The lineaments of Gospel books.

"Never yet has the church learned that the creed of Jesus is not assent to a form of words, but consent to a way of life." And again, in the sermon on the "Ministry of Music": "The church was built to music. If we could not answer atheism with an argument, we could smother it with an anthem. When we argue we are far apart; when we sing we are heart to heart."

We see N. is not interested in dogmatics at all; not in the confession of the mouth or the statements of a creed, but in the fruits of a Christ-like spirit. The church, in his opinion, is "a society for promoting goodness." Its first business, and the last, is to make good men and women, little brothers and sisters of the Lord Jesus who "went about doing good." The best laid plans of social betterment go awry for lack of men and women good enough to make them come true. Nevertheless, the discovery of the social gospel is the supreme achievement of the time. The most ambitious part of the social program is the movement for the outlawry of war. According to our faith in the ultimate reality of God or no God, so it will be unto us, whether war is to be eternal or the rule of force shall give way to the reign of reason.

Newton's insistence on the supreme importance of the Christian character, on the *effects* of faith, is surely justified. Only that faith is of value that issues in better lives. Still, life is always imperfect and certitude of salvation cannot rest on the degree of righteousness we have attained. The supreme discovery of the Reformation was that man is justified by faith in Christ, not by his own works. The overemphasis of this truth led, in America, to the Unitarian counter-statement that "salvation is by character, not by faith" (Channing). The Unitarian, although possessed of great leaders, have not been able to win much of a following by their stress on ethics and their appeal to

reason. The foolishness of the Pauline gospel and the "sola fide" of the Reformers continued to find favor with the masses more than the moralistic preaching of the Unitarians.

Not once have we found in Newton's sermons a reference to this fact, that man enters a state of grace by the simple trust in Christ, and that all through his Christian development Christ and his redemption continues to be the foundation of his fellowship with God.

As to the matter of creeds and doctrinal statements, the church has always felt the need of defining what she considers the "articuli stantis and cadentis ecclesiae." Her original intention was, thus to mark off truth from error. Even as late as 1926, when the Methodists of Canada united with the Presbyterians and the Congregationalists (the latter a comparatively liberal body), they adopted a very elaborate —and very orthodox—creed (see "Magazine," July, 1926, p. 273 ff). To us their creedal articles seemed spun out to unnecessary lengths; but doubtless the Presbyterians would not be satisfied with less.

Newton thinks the day is coming when the church will invite all good men to work and worship together in the name of the Eternal Goodness. We are rather inclined to believe that the church will stand by the Apostles' Creed, and that she will insist that goodness comes by the redemptive life and power of Christ and that no other way will quite suffice. In the light of the past we believe the time will never come when the church will shed her theology. From her beginning she has always maintained her trinitarian faith. She has always seen in Christ more than the "supreme revealer of God and the realization of perfect humanity." She has seen in him the one who brings about the objective reconciliation of mankind with God. The supernatural side of his person and works she has through her whole history contended for against all comers. In our opinion she will continue to stand for these things in her creed.

The titles of the sermons are such as these: the Golden Rule; the Meaning of Prayer; the Church for Today; the Final Church; the Soul and the Crowd; the Spirit of Truth; Amen. Newton is a poet; he gets his inspiration from the poets. He never even mentions a theologian. He seems to compose with astonishing ease, his sentences rolling out from him smooth and graceful. He is somewhat of a mystic; Troeltsch would class him with the "spiritualists." The prayers which precede each sermon also have a saintly charm, they are quite unlike the prayers we generally hear.

It is a rare treat to read such sermons, perhaps on a Sunday afternoon. They do not indoctrinate but they cultivate a sweet Christian spirit, and they reveal the author's gifted, noble soul.

The Outlawry of War. A Constructive Policy for World Peace, by *Charles Clayton Morrison*, D.D., Litt. D. Editor "The Christian Century." With a Foreword by John Dewey, Professor of Philosophy, Columbia University. Willett, Clark and Colby—Chicago, 1927. 300 p. $3.00.

Mr. Morrison has traveled far since 1917. When the War broke out he spent some time as an honored guest of the Britsh government behind the lines in France. No doubt at that time he felt that the cause of the Allies was the cause of civilization and the hope of the world; that the war was a holy crusade to save democracy from being strangled by that "Potsdam gang"; and that after this war the millennium was just in the offing. When peace was declared and the Versailles Treaty was made public he began to feel a sinking of the heart. He had not, like Atlene Pomerene, wished for a "rattlesnake peace" for the Germans, and the peace of Versailles was just that. His idealism had been genuine and now he saw that the idealism of the Allies had only been camouflage and that they had been out for plunder all the time.

It took him several years to convince himself that the Germans were not the sole originators of the war. Still he deserves everlasting credit for publishing, in his own paper, those famous articles of Professor Barnes, where that doughty champion sought to show that Russia and France were the real war criminals, not Germany.

His experiences with the World War have disillusionized Mr. Morrison very thoroughly. He has come to see that not only that war was a bane and not a blessing, but that war itself is an unmitigated evil. He is, however, by no means satisfied with that negative result or with an attitude of resignation. On the contrary, he has joined himself to that group of "irreconcilables" who have sworn eternal enmity to war itself and will never rest until war as an institution is abolished.

Since the termination of the World War the movement for peace has found expression in a number of schemes. The League of Nations, the Geneva protocol, the Locarno pact have all tried to make their contribution to the cause of peace: they all tried to limit or prevent war. However, their fatal mistake was that they aimed to prevent war *by war* or by the threat of war; they all left war itself, war as a legitimate institution, undisturbed. They condemned *aggressive* war and banded themselves together against a possible aggressor nation. The trouble about the outlawing of aggressive war is that it won't work. The World War has shown that every nation going to war claims to do it in defense of its rights, and who is to determine who is the aggressor?

Therefore the only way out of the dilemma is to decide to have done with these gradual "steps" towards war's elimination, and outlaw war itself. The first proposition of this kind was made by Mr. Levinson, and the movement has finally resulted in Senator Borah's resolution before the United States Senate "to outlaw war by interna-

tional treaty, to create a satisfactory code of international law whose fundamental stipulation is just this outlawry of war, and thus organize the world for peace."

This is the plan that Mr. Morrison upholds in this book with all the fervor of a devout believer and all the skill of a keen logician. He knows the stupendous difficulties in the way; knows that nothing short of a world revolution can bring it to pass. He says: "The outlawry of war involves a complete and radical reorientation of the nations in their international relationships. War cannot effectually be displaced by anything but law—not by arbitration, not by cutting down armaments, nor by military alliances with nicely balanced power, nor by a political league of national units deciding disputes through diplomats, nor by regional pacts, nor by overwhelming force concentrated at a single world center—but by law universally recognized and embodied in a court vested with authority to apply it to international disputes. Has not the hour struck for the nations to pluck this infamous institution out of the legal system of civilization—to set up in the place long held by this Supreme Court of War a *Supreme Court of Justice and Peace?*" The decision of the Court would be enforced by the weight of the public opinion of all enlightened nations. The employment of force is neither contemplated nor required.

In following the author in his well reasoned and at times passionately expressed presentation, it is almost equally hard to be a doubting Thomas as a believing Peter. If we hold the view that the Kingdom of God is ultimately to prevail in this world, war no doubt must go; still it seems an ideal so remote at the present time that one feels like saying with Faust: "I hear the message but I lack the faith." True the American churches have given the program strong support, but these same churches a few years ago were as war-mad as their European allies. Have they experienced a real change of heart, have they shown fruit meet for repentance? On Nov. 11 we had in this city an Armistice celebration of the church people. The speaker, a Jewish rabbi, told them our war had been a needless war: the church people fairly gasped! Among all the Christian ministers on the platform there was not one who would have endorsed that statement. The account of the rabbi's most remarkable address was hidden away in the local papers: like clergy, like people. Some have doubtless seen the light but they are doing nothing to remedy the wrongs done while we helped the Allies win their war. As long as we fail to make the slightest effort to undo the harm caused by us, in a very concrete instance, our ideals may indeed soar sky-high but they have no feet to walk on this earth.

Mr. Morrison has sung a great song, and there is no question it is a song of Zion, in fact it is an elaboration on the angel's song in Bethlehem's fields. He means what he sings; most others seldom mean what they sing, they just sing. There will probably a good many years go by before all people sing as Mr. Morrison does, and still more till they all mean what they are singing.

Erinnerungen einer deutschen Pfarrfrau aus 52jähriger Amtszeit in Süd- und Nord-Amerika von **Emilie Schaefer.** Eden Publishing House, St. Louis-Chicago. 1927. 159 Seiten.

Unser Verlag hat uns ein Buch auf den Weihnachtstisch gelegt, das ohne Zweifel ein „best seller" des Jahres werden wird. Es sind die Lebenserinnerungen von Frau Pastor Schaefer, der Redakteurin der „Frauenecke" im „Friedensboten." In ihnen tritt uns Emilie Schaefer entgegen, wie sie leibt und lebt: eine scharfe Beobachterin des kirchlichen und öffentlichen Lebens, mit ihrer Meinung nirgends zurückhaltend, Licht und Schatten gerecht verteilend in ihrem Urteil landläufiger Verhältnisse.

Ihr Herz schlägt warm für die deutsche Sache. Die Leiden des deutschen Vaterlands und besonders der Deutschamerikaner werden eindrücklich und mit wohl ausgeführter Kleinmalerei geschildert. Die edlen Leistungen des „Deutschen Hilfswerks" erfahren gebührende Beachtung. Jedoch auch die Schattenseiten deutschen kirchlichen Lebens hier und drüben werden nicht verschwiegen. Im Gegenteil, sie werden deutlich hervorgehoben, und gelegentlich läßt sich die Verfasserin in begeistertem Tribut an den „englischen Geist," d. i. die Vorzüge des amerikanischen Charakters, zu Uebertreibungen hinreißen. Z. B. sagt sie in einem solchen Zusammenhang, in Amerika stehe alle Arbeit im Zeichen des Dienstes, nicht des Profits. Selbst der Zeitungsjunge verkaufe seine Zeitungen nicht so sehr um des Verdienstes willen, sondern um in dieser nationalen Organisation des Dienstes aller sein bescheiden Teil beizutragen. Als wir dies lasen, fühlten wir uns versucht, mit Festus auszurufen: „Paule, du rasest, die große Kunst macht dich rasend!"

Doch solche kleine Entgleisungen verdienen kaum der Erwähnung. Aufs ganze gesehen, hat sich Verfasserin wohl im Zaum. Ja, ihr trefflich abwägender Gerechtigkeitssinn ist ein Hauptvorzug des Buches. Hier und da mag es Pastoren geben, denen ihre aggressive Art, ihre Offenherzigkeit und bibelfeste Schlagfertigkeit etwas auf die Nerven fällt. Wir dagegen gehören zu denen, welchen diese Eigenschaften an ihr baß gefallen.

Im Unterschied von andern Geschichten fängt Frau Schaefers Lebensbeschreibung mit der Hochzeit an. Sie hat ein bewegtes Leben geführt, und manche interessante Erlebnisse werden mit geschicktem Pinsel aufgetragen. Sie sind nicht nur Schilderungen persönlichen Lebens, sondern werfen helles Licht auf Land und Leute.

Wir zweifeln nicht, daß besonders die Leser der „Frauenecke" sich mit Gusto auf dies Buch werfen werden. Wir erwarten, daß es abgehen wird wie die sprichwörtlichen „warmen Brötchen." Verfasserin hat viel getan, den Frauen unsrer Kirche zu Recht und Anerkennung zu verhelfen. Es wäre daher nur natürlich, wenn die Frauen ihrem Buch zu einem reißenden Absatz die Wege bahnten. Auch von drüben sollten viele Aufträge kommen. Wir versprechen dem Buch einen durchschlagenden Erfolg.